

The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES.

VOL. XXII, No. 4.

APRIL 1942

THE SACRAMENT OF DIVINE ADOPTION

AS is well known, in early Christian times the Sacrament of Baptism was administered at dawn on Easter Sunday after a whole night spent by the neophytes in prayer and in listening to the reading of biblical excerpts and to the last catechetical instructions. Nowadays all that is but a historical memory. However, it is still our great good fortune to possess a beautiful reminder of those early rites in the ceremonies of Holy Saturday. The Collect of the Mass is still as follows :

*Dens, qui hanc sacratissimam noctem gloria
Dominicae Resurrectionis illustras : conserva
in nova familiae tuae progenie adoptionis
spiritum quem dedisti ; ut corpore et mente
renovati puram Tibi exhibeant servitutem.*

O God, who makest this most sacred night resplendent with the glory of Our Lord's Resurrection : preserve in the new children of Thy family the spirit of Adoption which Thou hast given, that renewed in body and soul, they may offer a loyal service unto Thee.

In this Collect, as well as in several of the prayers which follow each prophecy, the Liturgy stresses the fact that the Sacrament of Baptism is the Sacrament of our Divine Adoption. We think it will not be without interest to compile in the following pages a brief patristic and liturgical anthology on the doctrine of man's Divine Adoption, so often referred to in the New Testament, and consequently in the Liturgy and by the Fathers and theologians.

In unmistakable terms both St. Paul and St. John declare the ultimate end of Christ's new economy of grace to be the raising of man to the status and dignity of a child of God by adoption. Their texts have, of course, become *loci classici* in Catholic Theology. St. Paul writes to the Ephesians :¹

In love He predestinated us to be adopted as his sons . . . ;

and to the Romans : ²

Ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry : Abba, Father . . . for those He hath foreknown, them He hath predestined to bear a nature in the image of His Son ;

and to the Galatians : ³

God sent forth His Son . . . that we might enter upon our adoption as sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into our hearts crying, "Abba, Father !" Wherefore thou art no longer a slave, but a son ; and if a son, an heir also by the act of God.

¹ i, 5.—This and the following Pauline quotations are from the Westminster version.

² viii, 15 ; 29.

³ iv, 4-7.

St. John is no less explicit when he writes in his first Epistle : ¹

Behold what manner of charity the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called, and should be, the sons of God ;

and even more emphatically in the prologue to his Gospel : ²

as many as received Him, He gave them power to be made the sons of God.

Theologians of all ages, from the early Fathers to contemporary ascetical writers, have loved to explore the import of the above startling statements. St. Thomas's exposition will suffice for them all : ³

A man adopts someone as his son inasmuch as out of goodness he admits him as heir to his state. . . . Wherefore, inasmuch as God, of His goodness, admits men to the inheritance of beatitude, He is said to adopt them. Moreover, Divine exceeds human adoption, inasmuch as God, by bestowing His grace, makes man whom He adopts worthy to receive the heavenly inheritance.

By adoption we are made the brethren of Christ, as having with Him the same Father . . . ⁴

Adoptive sonship is a certain likeness to the Eternal Sonship ; just as all that takes place in time is a certain likeness of what has been from eternity. Now man is likened to the splendour of the Eternal Son by reason of the light of grace which is attributed to the Holy Ghost. Therefore adoption, though common to the whole Trinity, is appropriated to the Father as its author ; to the Son, as its exemplar ; to the Holy Ghost, as imprinting on us the likeness of this exemplar (*Et ideo adoptio, licet sit communis toti Trinitati, appropriatur tamen Patri ut auctori, Filio ut Exemplari, Spiritui Sancto ut imprimenti in nobis hujus exemplaris similitudinem*).⁵

Now, all the Fathers and theologians, with one accord, affirm that the great dignity of being adopted children of God is the ultimate, as well as the highest and noblest, effect conferred upon us through the Sacrament of Baptism, which for this reason they simply term, again in a Pauline phrase,⁶ "the bath of regeneration" (*lavacrum regenerationis*), "the Sacrament of regeneration" (*Sacramentum regenerationis*), or, "the Sacrament of Divine Adoption" (*Sacramentum Divinae Adoptionis, vel Adoptionis Filiorum*). A few quotations from the Fathers may be conveniently transcribed here, more in order to delight once more in their freshness and beauty than because we need labour this point any further.

Clement of Alexandria writes : ⁷

Being baptized we are illumined, being illumined we are adopted children, being adopted children we are made perfect, being made perfect we become immortal.

Note the gradation of the baptismal effects in the following enumeration by St. Basil : ⁸

¹ I John, iii, 1.

² *Summa*, III, q. 23, art. 1, c.—Translation by the Dominican Fathers of the English Province.

³ *Ibid* art. 2, ad. 2.

⁴ *Ibid* ad. 3.—See also the third article of the same question (23), especially the *corpus*. Besides : IIa, IIac, q. 45, 6, c. et. ad. 1 ; III, q. 3, 5, ad. 2 ; q. 39, 8, ad. 3 (quoted below) ; q. 45, 4, c. ; etc.

⁵ Tit. iii, 5-7.

⁷ *Paedagogus*, I, 26, 1.

⁸ *Hom. in Sanctum Baptisma*, 13, 5.

² i, 12.

Baptism is the price for the redemption of captives, the pardon of debts, the death of sin, the new birth of the soul, a light-woven garment, an unbreakable seal, a chariot (vehicle) to heaven, a claim to the kingdom, the charism of adoption.

St. John Chrysostom is still more explicit in stressing the positive effects of Baptism as follows:¹

... there are some who say that the heavenly grace received in Baptism is only the remission of sins.

He denies that and goes on to enumerate the positive effects of the Sacrament:

... sanctity, justice, adoption, heredity, the fraternity and the membership of Christ.

The Latin Fathers are quite emphatic on the subject.² Again we quote here St. Thomas Aquinas as epitomizing them all. He comments on Christ's Baptism in the Jordan and remarks that it was becoming that Christ's Godhead should be proclaimed:³

especially at the time of baptism by which men are born again into adopted sons of God; since God's sons by adoption are made to be like unto His natural Son, according to Rom., viii, 29: Whom He foreknew He also predestinated to be made conformable to the image of His Son. Hence Hilary says: that when Jesus was baptized, the Holy Ghost descended on Him, and that the Father's voice was heard saying: "This is my beloved Son", that we might know from what was accomplished in Christ, that after being washed in the waters of baptism the Holy Ghost comes down upon us from on high, and that the Father's voice declares us to have become the adopted sons of God (*Super Matth., II*).

The Fathers of the Council of Trent were therefore more than warranted in describing justification through Baptism, as⁴

the translation from that state in which man is born a child of the first Adam, to the state of grace and of being adopted children of God through the second Adam, Jesus Christ, our Saviour.

The doctrine of Divine Adoption through the sacramental waters is perhaps even more clearly set forth in the ancient liturgical formulae connected with the administration of Baptism. As only a few survive in our present-day missals and rituals, chiefly in the ceremony of the Blessing of the Font on Holy Saturday, we shall have recourse to the most representative of the early Sacramentaries, that which goes by the name of Pope Gelasius, in the composition of which St. Leo the Great (*d.* 461) had beyond doubt a lion's share.⁵

Before studying the liturgical texts themselves a few notes seem called

¹ *Hom. in Neophytos*, ap. S. Aug., contra Jul., I, 6, 21.

² Cf. particularly the exhaustive treatises on Baptism written by Tertullian, SS. Ambrose and Augustine.

³ III, 39, 8, ad. 3.

⁴ *Sess. VI*, ch. 4.

⁵ Throughout we have made use of the edition published in 1680 by the great Cardinal Liturgiologist, Blessed Joseph Mary Tommasi: *Codices Sacramentorum nongentis annis vetustiores, nimirum, Libri III Sacramentorum Romanæ Ecclesiæ. . . . Primum prodeunt cura et studio Joseph Mariæ Thomasi Cong. Clericorum Regularium Presbyteri. Romæ, ex typographia Angeli Barnabo, M.DC.LXXXI.*

for in order to place them in their proper historical setting. As has been said, during the earlier Christian centuries (third to eighth) Baptism was administered in the Western Churches on Easter Sunday at dawn. It was followed by the Sacrament of Confirmation, and at the Mass of the same Easter morning the newly baptized received their first Holy Communion—the Sacrament of the Body and the Blood of Christ. It was their day of days—the *dies quam fecit Dominus* of the Easter Liturgy. Throughout the whole period of the preceding Lent the candidates for Holy Baptism had to go through an elaborate ceremonial, the dates of which slightly differed according to the different Churches, but which usually comprised the following rites: ¹ (i) the candidates handed in their application for Baptism and became *electi* or *competentes*; (ii) they attended a course of instruction on Christian doctrine, chiefly on the Sacraments; (iii) they were submitted to several—usually three—scrutinies, each of which was accompanied by a suggestive ritual—exorcisms, unctions, the touching with saliva of the organs of the bodily sense, etc.; (iv) on one of these occasions the opening chapter of each of the four Gospels was publicly read to the catechumens—in *aperitiones aurium*, or *Dominus legem dat*—followed by the recitation aloud of the Symbol—*traditio Symboli*—and of the Lord's Prayer—*traditio Orationis Dominicae*—which was briefly explained to them by the bishop; (v) the Chrism was solemnly blessed, usually on Maundy Thursday, as well as the water, on Holy Saturday night before Baptism itself was administered.²

When, however, the administration of Baptism to infants became a general practice, most of that ceremonial lost its *raison d'être* and the pregnant prayers and prefaces which accompanied each rite were no longer transcribed in the liturgical books. Only a few, as we have said, have remained, and are to be reckoned among the finest in our missals. The Gelasian Sacramentary, which was the outcome of the first five centuries of Christian worship in Rome, preserves all these ancient formulae.

Now, to come back to our main point, the fact that Baptism *ipso facto* makes us children of God by adoption is emphasized a hundred times over, in choice words, throughout that complicated ceremonial. We cite only a few.³ The import of our first quotation should be thoroughly grasped, for

¹ Cf. Dom (Cardinal) Ildefonso Schuster, *The Sacramentary*. Vol. II. *The Lenten Liturgy at Rome, and The Easter Triduum in the Roman Missal*, pp. 3–29, London (Burns Oates and Washbourne), 1925; Dom Ambrose Marinelli, O.S.B., *Liturgia Battesimale nella Quaresima*, in *Rivista Liturgica*, 1915, n. 3, pp. 153–162; Dom Pérez de Urbel, O.S.B., *Itinerario Liturgico*, Madrid, 1940, h.1.

² A summary of all these, at that time separate, rites is still preserved in the administration of Baptism.

³ The texts are too numerous to be given in full. The reader can find them in *Tommasi*, op. cit., as follows: On p. 37, *Tertia Dominica quas pro Scrutiniis Electorum celebratur*; on p. 41, *Quarta Dominica pro Scrutinio II*; on pp. 44–45, *Quinta Dominica quas pro Scrutinio (III) celebratur*; on p. 48, *Demutatio pro Scrutinio, quod tertia hebdomada in Quadragesima, II feria initiat*; on p. 48, *Oratio (IV) super Electos ad Catechumenum faciendum*. Again, on pp. 75, 80, 82 (*Benedictio Fontis*), 85 (*Oratio in nocte*—the same we say today), 86 (magnificent preface), 87, 92, 93, 94, 95, 108, 111, 127. Cf. also the Mozarabic Missal, *V Dom. Adventus*, *Ad. Orat. Dominicae: ut efficeremur per adoptionem filii, qui servi esse ex nostro merito eramus indigni; et passim*.

in it we find it plainly stated that our first parents had already received from God the dignity of his adopted children, which they lost through sin, and to which we are restored by Baptism. The prayer was said over the catechumens at their first scrutiny. It is this : ¹

Da, quaesumus, Domine Electis nostris digne atque sapienter ad confessionem tuæ laudis accedere : ut dignitati pristinae quam originali transgressione perdiderant, per tuam gloriam reformentur.

Grant, we beseech Thee, O Lord, that our Elect may worthily and wisely undertake the confession of Thy praise : that through Thy glory they may be restored to that former dignity which they lost through the original transgression.

Compare with this prayer the verse sung on Maundy Thursday during the consecration of the Chrism :

Ut novetur sexus omnis unctione Chrismatis : ut sanetur sauciata dignitatis gloria.

In order that both sexes may be renewed through the unction of Chrism ; that the wounded glory of our dignity may be healed.

At the ceremony of the *Traditio Orationis Dominicae*, i.e. the solemn recitation of the Lord's Prayer by the catechumens, the bishop briefly commented on each of its petitions. This is how he explained the first : ²

PATER NOSTER QUI ES IN COELIS. Haec libertatis vox est, et plena fiducia. Ergo his vobis moribus est vivendum, ut et filii Dei et Fratres Christi esse possitis. Nam Patrem suum Deum, qua temeritate dicere praesumit, qui ab ejus voluntate degenerat? Unde, vos, dilectissimi, dignos exhibete adoptione divina: quoniam scriptum est: Quotquot crediderunt in Eum, dedit eis potestatem filios Dei fieri.

Our Father who art in Heaven. This is the voice of liberty, and full hope. Therefore you have to live in such a way as to be able to become children of God and brothers of Christ. For who, having fallen away from God's will (literally, lost God's sonship), would dare to call God his own Father? Show yourselves, therefore, most beloved, worthy of the Divine Adoption, because it is written: As many as believed in Him, He gave them power to be made the sons of God.

The initial exorcism for the consecration of Chrism on Maundy Thursday contained—and still contains—these words : ³

Exorcizo te, creatura Olei . . . ut fias omnibus qui ex te unctioni sunt, in adoptionem filiorum per Spiritum Sanctum.

I exorcize thee, thou created oil . . . that thou mayest be of use to all who shall be anointed with thee, unto the Adoption of Sons through the Holy Ghost.

The catechumens are specially prayed for in the Great Litany of Good Friday :

. . . auge fidem et intellectum catechumenis nostris : ut renati fonte Baptismatis, adoptionis Tuae filiis adregentur.

. . . increase the faith and understanding of our catechumens ; that being born afresh in the Baptismal Font, they may be added to the number of the children of Thy Adoption.

¹ Tommasi, op. cit., p. 57.

² Ibid, p. 58.

³ Ibid., p. 108.

Practically all the Collects of Holy Saturday should be quoted here. The priest prays :

... *promissionis filios sacra adoptione dilata* ...

... increase by Thy sacred Adoption the children of Thy promise ...

and before entering the Baptistery to bless the Font :

... *ad creandos novos populos quos Tibi fons Baptismatis paravit, spiritum adoptionis emitte* ...

... send forth the Spirit of Adoption to create a new people, whom the Baptismal Font brings forth to Thee ...

We have transcribed above the Collect of the Mass of Holy Saturday. Even more expressive was the proper preface used on that day in earlier times :¹

... *Exultavit Maria in sacratissimo puerperio. Escultat Ecclesia in filiorum suorum generationis specie* ...

Mary rejoiced in her most sacred child-bearing. The Church rejoices in the mystical birth of her children.

Baptism was followed by the Sacrament of Confirmation, and during Mass the neophytes received their first Holy Communion. Afterwards, in sundry Western Churches, they partook of a dish of milk and honey. Finally they were clothed in a white garment, which they were to wear during the whole of Easter Week, and were dismissed by the bishop with the solemn farewell : *Immaculatum serva Baptismum tuum*. The whole of Easter Week was considered to belong liturgically in a special way to the neophytes. Each day they went in procession to the Baptistery. Even in our modern missals and breviaries there are traces of all these symbolical ceremonies, as for example the Introits of the Masses in Easter Week, or the opening stanza of the hymn at Vespers :

*Ad regias Agni dapes
stolis amicti candidis
post transitum Maris Rubri
Christo canamus Principi.*²

Now at the Lamb's high royal feast
In holy robes of white we sing,
Through the Red Sea in safety brought,
To Jesus our immortal King;

or again the graceful Responsory at Matins (Saturday after Easter) :

*Isti sunt Agni novelli,
alleluia,
qui annuntiaverunt,
alleluia,
modo venerunt ad fontes,
repleti sunt claritate,
alleluia, alleluia.
In conspectu Agni amicti
sunt stolis albis et palmae
in manibus eorum.
Repleti sunt claritate,
alleluia, alleluia.*

These are the new-born lambs,
alleluia,
who have proclaimed (Christ),
alleluia,
they have but now come to the water-springs,
they are filled with splendour,
alleluia, alleluia.
In the presence of the Lamb they stand
clothed in white robes and with palms
in their hands.
They are filled with splendour,
alleluia, alleluia.

¹ Ibid., p. 86.

² According to the original, in the Monastic Breviary :
*Ad coenam Agni providi
et stolis albis candidi*, etc.

On the octave day of their Baptism the newly baptized laid aside their white robes. Our Liturgy for Low Sunday—*Dominica in albis (vestibus depositis)*—is still full of references to that ancient ritual. This was not all. Each year a special day was chosen, during Eastertide, to celebrate the anniversary of Baptism in Mass and office. This day was termed the *Pascha Annotinum* (or in low medieval Latin, *Pascha annotina*). The proper Mass had the following Collect and *Infra Actionem*:¹

Deus, qui renatis fonte Baptismatis delictorum indulgentiam tribuisti; praesta miserere: ut recolentibus huius nativitatis insignia, plenam adoptionis gratiam largiaris.

Hanc igitur oblationem . . . quam annua recolentes mysteria, quibus eos tuis adoptasti regalibus institutis . . .

O God, who hast granted the pardon of their sins to those newborn at the Baptismal Font; mercifully grant to those who recall the privileges of that new birth the grace of full Adoption.

This oblation, therefore . . . which they offer unto Thee recalling the mysteries by which Thou didst adopt them into Thy royal household. . . .

We have still the Hymn which St. Venantius Fortunatus wrote for that Feast. This is the concluding stanza:²

*Gaudete, candidati,
electa vasa regni,
in morte consepulti,
Christi fide renati.*

Rejoice, ye white-robed,
chosen vessels of the kingdom,
buried together in death,
reborn through faith in Christ.

Whenever the need arose, solemn Baptism was again administered on Whitsun Eve. The proper preface for the Mass of that day (or rather night) was:³

Vere dignum . . . qui sacramentum Paschale consummans, quibus per Unigeniti tui consortium, filios adoptionis esse tribuisti, per Spiritum Sanctum largiris dona gratiarum, et sui cohaeredibus Redemptoris, jam nunc supernae pignus hereditatis impendis, ut tanto se certius ad eam confidant esse venturos, quanto in ejus participatione profecerint.

Who . . . as the consummation of the Paschal Mystery dost through the Holy Ghost bestow graces upon those who, through union with Thy Only Begotten, Thou didst make Sons by Adoption, to whom even now Thou dost give a pledge of their supernal inheritance, making them co-heirs with their Redeemer, in order that, as they have already drawn benefit from that inheritance, so they may with the more certainty hope hereafter to attain it.

The Holy Ghost indeed, with His sevenfold gift, seals that great Act of Divine Adoption, since, in the language of the Liturgy, He is poured down on the Children of Adoption—in *filios Adoptionis effudit*.⁴ This He accomplishes mainly through Baptism and the sacramental system. Baptism, therefore, is aptly described as the Sacrament of Divine Adoption.

¹ Tommasi, op. cit., pp. 92 and 93.

² Cf. Walpole, Early Latin Hymns, Cambridge, 1922, p. 192.

³ Tommasi, op. cit., p. 111.

⁴ Cf. also the Collect for the Feast of the Transfiguration.

May we conclude on a practical note? We hear that a revision of the Missal has been taken in hand in Rome. It is surely permissible to indulge the hope that some part at any rate of that ancient ritual, particularly some of the prayers and prefaces and the Mass for the anniversary of Baptism, may be restored, and we recommend this intention to the prayers of our modern champions of liturgical worship.

Furthermore, it has been the experience of the present writer that the faithful never tire of listening to sermons or lectures on this doctrine of our Divine Adoption, especially when it is put before them against the historical background of our ancient and unrivalled Liturgy. The appeal of the subject is easily understood when we remember that it embodies the essential message of the New Testament, the most comforting and uplifting that man has ever received: Thou art no longer a slave, but a son; and if a son, an heir also by the act of God.

DOM ROMANUS RIOS, O.S.B.

REFLECTIONS ON THE CO-REDEMPTION CONTROVERSY

IT is known that a good many petitions were sent to Pope Pius XI asking him to make some definition about our Lady's part in the work of redemption. Pius XI made no definition; and one may reasonably conjecture that in so deciding he was guided by the opinion of trusted theologians that the doctrines of the Redemption and of Grace have not yet been sufficiently clarified to make any definition possible.

Father Thomas Holland's thoughtful article on the subject in the February issue of *THE CLERGY REVIEW* will have indicated to readers that the subject is still involved in considerable obscurity, from which not even his gallant effort has succeeded in freeing it. The doctrine of the Redemption is not clearly enough defined to permit definition of Co-redemption. The existence of the redemption and its general meaning are clear and of faith; but the exact nature of the redemption is known to us only by comparisons and analogies, and its different aspects, all true and correct, are not too easily integrated or their relations understood. Undue insistence upon one similitude—for instance, picturing the redemption as something of a commercial transaction in which Christ paid our debts and left us with a bank balance to be distributed—is likely to fail in grasping the whole reality. Insistence exclusively upon the meritorious or satisfactory element in the redemption is apt to lead to forgetfulness of the sacrificial aspect with which in fact the redemptive act is identified. In consequence, we

must welcome discussions upon our Lady's relation to the Redemption, as giving a stimulus to a clarification of this fundamental doctrine.

Sin is a spiritual reality, and as such can only be understood by us in material terms—that is, in comparisons. So, too, grace is a spiritual reality, and can only be depicted to us in comparative terms. Much more, then, must the act of Christ which brought us from sin to grace be a spiritual reality impossible to express save in analogies or similitudes drawn from human experience. Now in Scripture the number of similitudes and analogies used to express from what we were redeemed, and to what, is large; and each of them expresses something of the truth, but none alone the whole truth. To select but a few:

| <i>Through Sin</i> | <i>Through Christ</i> |
|--|---|
| Captivity, bondage, slavery (John viii, 32 and 36; Mark x, 45. 2 Peter ii, 19; Paul <i>passim</i> .) | Deliverance, freedom, redemption Safety, relief, salvation |
| Danger, affliction, distress (Matt. i, 21; Luke ii, 11; John iv, 42; Acts xiii, 23; Philipp. iii, 20, etc.) | Healing, medicine, health ¹ |
| Infection, sickness, wound (Luke iv, 18; Matt. ix, 12; Mark ii, 3ff; 1 Peter ii, 24.) | Ease, refreshment, strength (Mt. xi, 28; Rom. v, 3-8) |
| Labour, burden, weight | Living water (John iv, 14; vii, 37; Apoc. vii, 17) |
| Thirst | Bread of heaven (John ch. vi; 1 Cor. x, 16) |
| Hunger, starvation | Light, vision (Luke ii, 32; John i, 5; viii, 12; xii, 35; Apoc. ii, 28; xxi, 23; 1 Peter i, 9) |
| Darkness, blindness | True road, a finding, leading home (Matt. xv, 24; Luke xix, 10; John xiv, 6) |
| Going astray, being lost | Home, domestics, fellow-heirs, co-partners, sons (John xiv, 2, 3; Ephesians ii, 19; 3, 6) |
| Exile, strangers, foreigners | The Vine, the good olive-tree (John xv, 1-7; Romans xi, 17 ff) |
| Branch broken from tree | The Potter, unleavened bread (Rom. ix, 21; 1 Cor. v, 6; Gal. v, 9. St. Augustine) |
| Mass or lump of clay or of dough | Renewal of the likeness or image (Coloss. iii, 10; Philip. iii, 21. St. Athanasius) |
| A likeness or image defaced | Washing clean, purification (Apoc. i, 5; 1 Cor. vi, 11; Tit. ii, 14) |
| Stain, defilement | Innocence, justification, blotting out guilt (Romans v; 1 John ii, 1; Coloss. ii, 14) |
| Guilt, adverse judgment, condemnation | Blessing, grace, favour (Mt. xxv, 34; Luke xii, 47; Eph. i, 3; John i, 14-17, etc. Paul <i>passim</i> .) |
| Curse, malediction | Reconciliation, propitiation, placation (Paul <i>passim</i>) |
| Offence, enmity, wrath of God | Restoration, repair, reparation, temple of God (Acts xv, 16; 1 Peter ii, 7; 1 Cor. iii, 9; Eph. ii, 21, etc. Mt. xvii, 11; Mark, ix, 12) |
| Collapse, ruin, destruction | Resurrection and eternal life (John x, 10 and <i>passim</i> ; Romans vi, 23; 1 Peter i, 3; Matt. xix, 28) |
| Death and corruption | Union with God, glory (Mt. xxv, 43; II Peter i, 4; 1 John iii, 1; John xvii, 21) |
| Separation from God | |

¹ It is interesting to note that Eusebius, Epiphanius and Cyril of Jerusalem derive the name Jesus from the Greek word meaning to heal or cure a wound or illness, cf. Petavius, *De Incarnatione*, II, ch. vi, n. 11. That Christ is our Saviour in the sense that a doctor saves a sick man is suggested by the comparison in St. John of the brazen serpent which cured the bite of the fiery serpents: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the desert, so must the son of man be lifted up . . . for God sent not his Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world may be saved by him." John iii, 14 and 17.

Doubtless other comparisons could be found in Scripture, as certainly many others are found in the Fathers; but these are sufficient to show that the redemptive act, which causes our change from one state to the other, must itself be described in varying comparisons. If the evil of sin is described in physical terms like sickness, blindness, hunger, defaced images, poisoned dough, broken branches, collapse and ruin, and physical death, then the work of our Saviour tends to be conceived in corresponding physical terms: He is the Healer, the Light, the Way, the Good Shepherd, the Vine, the Restorer, the Source of Life, and so on. But if the evil of sin be described in terms of personal relationships, or in juridical language, then our Saviour's work is conceived in the moral order: He is the Mediator, the Reconciler, the Propitiator, our Advocate, our Satisfaction, our Priest. Hence some theologians draw a distinction between "physical" mediation and "moral" mediation, or between "natural" mediation and "ethical" mediation.¹ Hence non-Catholic writers speak of different "theories" of the redemption, the "ransom" theory, the "satisfaction" theory, the "forensic" theory,² and they can advance this ground that the Fathers sometimes urge one comparison to the apparent exclusion of any other—St. Athanasius, for example, dwells so much upon the idea that the Incarnation restored the image of God in man that it is not easy to see how the ransom analogy will fit into his scheme.³

The redemptive act is a reality so great and so mysterious—for the Redemption is a mystery as is the Incarnation—that it can only be expressed in comparative and analogous terms. This does not mean, of course, that these terms are mere mental inventions; quite the contrary: each expresses the truth, though no single one is adequate to express the whole truth, or rather the whole bearing of the truth. A synthesis of the varying similitudes and analogies has yet to be made.

St. Thomas, however, with his usual limpidity and solidity, gives the best synthesis I know:

"Next arises consideration of the effect of Christ's passion; and first, as to its manner of working (*de modo efficiendi*). About this, six questions may be asked: 1, Whether the passion of Christ caused our salvation by way of merit; 2, whether by way of satisfaction; 3, whether by way of sacrifice; 4, whether by way of redemption; 5, whether to be the Redeemer be the peculiar characteristic of Christ (*sit proprium Christi*); 6, whether He caused the effect of our salvation by true efficient causality (*per modum efficientiae*).⁴

¹ Pesch, *De Verbo Incarnato*, n. 414 and Pohle-Preuss *Soteriology*, Herder, London, 1927, p. 6 ff., regard the "natural" mediation as only the foundation for the "moral" mediation. J. Rivière, *The Doctrine of the Atonement*, English translation, Kegan Paul Trench, London, 1909, regards the "physical" mediation, or the hypostatic union, as a mere *conditio sine qua non* for the moral atonement.

² Cf. for instance David Smith, D.D., *The Atonement in the Light of History*, London, p. 61 ff.

³ Anyone who reads Athanasius' *On the Incarnation of the Word* and then reads Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo* will at once perceive the different emphasis upon the physical comparisons and the juridical comparisons; but the difference is only one of emphasis, not of substance.

⁴ *Summa*, p. 3, 48, a. 6.

This is to say that Thomas considers the one act of redemption as having diverse relations: in its relation to the divinity, it is a true efficient act; in its relation to the human will of Christ, it is merit; in its relation to Christ's sufferings, it is satisfaction; in its relation to our release from sin and its consequences, it is redemption; in its relation to our union with God, it is sacrifice. (Q. 48, a. 6 ad 3.) The one indivisible act, looked at in its varying relations, is redemption, satisfaction, merit, sacrifice and the efficient cause of our salvation. This is why we can speak of our Saviour meriting by His Sacrifice and satisfying by His merits and causing our salvation by His redemption, or by His merits, or by His sacrifice or by His satisfaction. His sacrifice *was* the satisfaction and *was* the merit and *was* the redemption and the cause of our salvation. The same one act is spoken of in different terms to indicate differing relations which are essential to it and inseparable from it.

It must be added that Thomas considers our salvation to consist not only in sanctifying grace or the beatific vision, but also in the resurrection; and he holds that the resurrection of Christ is an effective cause of our resurrection—indeed, following the Fathers, he says that Christ's resurrection is the cause of the resurrection even of the wicked. (Q. 56, a. 1, ad. 3.) The scriptural foundation is John v, 21: "For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and giveth life; so the Son also giveth life to whom he will", and 1 Corinthians xv, 20: "But now Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep: for by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the dead. And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive."

The Liturgy likewise regards Christ as the cause of our resurrection: "Qui mortem nostram moriendo destruxit, et vitam resurgendo reparavit." "In quo spes beatæ resurrectionis effulsit."

Now in all these aspects of the redemptive work of Christ, Thomas holds one principle as fundamental: the humanity of Christ is personally united to the divinity, is a personal instrument of the divinity as my hand is my personal instrument, and hence Christ in His manhood can work as an efficient cause of grace, of the resurrection and of all that our salvation imports. (Cf. Q. 48, a. 6 corpus, and Q. 56, a. 1, ad. 2 and ad. 3.)

To return, now, to the Co-redemption controversy. Co-redemption in the strict sense has been defined, by Fr. Holland, following several others, as an immediate sharing in the act itself of redemption. It follows, then, that such a share in the very act of redemption must involve a share in all the relations which that one and indivisible act connotes; consequently it involves an immediate share in the merit, the satisfaction, the redemption, the sacrifice and the causality which effects our salvation. Moreover, on similar principles, each of the similitudes used in Scripture to express the causing of the transition from sin to salvation must be verified of the Co-redemption: the language and what it conveys should find a ready and unforced application both to the Redemption and to the Co-redemption.

To look, then, at two of the relative connotations of the redemptive act: true causality of our salvation, and sacrifice:

True causality in our salvation means efficient causality; and the general teaching of the Fathers and of theologians is that only God can be the principal cause of grace, because grace is a participation in the personal life of God; there is no power in a created nature to demand that the Holy Ghost should dwell within it, that it should see God face to face, that it should share as a co-heir and son in the inheritance and sonship of the natural Son of God. The order of Grace is completely a free gift from God, beyond created nature's merits and power. The humanity of Christ can be an instrumental cause, just as the ministers of the sacraments and the sacraments themselves can be instrumental causes. But the reason why the humanity of Christ can be the instrumental cause is the hypostatic union: "because the humanity of Christ," says Thomas (Q. 48, a. 6 c.), "is the instrument of the divinity, therefore in consequence all the actions and sufferings of Christ work in power of the divinity for human salvation". This is the reason given why our Lord could work miracles at will (Q. 43, a. 2) and the reason why Christ could by His institution give power to the sacraments to produce grace (Q. 62, a. 5): "Who can forgive sins but God only?"¹ "Were you baptized in the name of Paul?"²

So strongly did the Fathers hold to the principle that God alone is the cause of the supernatural that they argue "The Holy Ghost is the author of sanctification, therefore He is equal to God."³ They also argue from the redemption wrought by Christ in this order of Providence to the divinity of Christ: if He were not God, then He did not really save us, but if He did really save us, then He is God.⁴

St. Athanasius puts it:

"If the Son were a created thing, then man would have remained mortal, as not being united to God. For no created thing can unite other created things to God, since they themselves need someone to unite them. Nor could any part of created nature become the salvation of creation, since it itself needs saving."⁵ St. Basil: "How could it be that one should die for all who should pay the just price for all, if that suffering were the suffering only of a mere man? But if God suffered death according to human nature as having made His very own that suffering of His flesh, then alone can we rightly affirm that the death of one according to the flesh was a fair price for the life of all men."⁶ St. Leo the Great, arguing against Nestorius, who denied the divinity of Christ, says: "We should not be able to over-

¹ Luke v, 21.

² I Cor. i, 13.

³ Cf. v.g. Boyer *De Gratia*, thesis 14, p. 195; but the argument is a commonplace among theologians, though too often forgotten.

⁴ Franzelin, *De Verbo Incarnato*, 3a ed., thesis 4, p. 25 ff., and Petavius, op. cit., bk. 2, ch. xii, n. 9.

⁵ Oration 4 against the Arians, 2, 68, *Migne P. G.*, 26, 292.

⁶ Letter 50 to Valerian, *Migne P. L.* 77, 263.

come the author of sin and death unless He should take our nature and make it His, Whom no sin could defile nor death hold down."¹

From the Eucharist likewise the Fathers argue to the divinity of Christ: in order to institute the Eucharist, He must be God and man. St. Hilary argues that "the Eucharist is a means of eternal life: now the Eucharist is the very flesh and blood of Christ: if then Christ be not God, how can His flesh give us eternal life with God?"² St. Cyril of Alexandria, in his controversy to maintain the truth of the Incarnation against Nestorianism, argues that if the flesh and blood we receive in the Eucharist were merely that of a man closely united to God, or a very holy man, or of a man in whom the divinity made His dwelling, then that flesh would not be truly vivifying, since it would not be the flesh of the Word made flesh; "for," he proceeds, "Life itself, which is God, because it was united to His own flesh, rendered it vivifying . . . if we think it the flesh of a man like ourselves, how can it be life-bringing?"³

St. Thomas's argument, therefore, is sound: Christ as man could perform the redemptive act, as in fact it was performed, solely in virtue of His divinity hypostatically united to His humanity. It follows then that the redemptive act, like the power of instituting sacraments, is absolutely singular to the hypostatic union. Any immediate share in that act, therefore, would seem to involve an equally immediate share in the hypostatic union, which is clearly nonsense. It would likewise involve the power of being able to institute sacraments, or at least of co-instituting them: but is it conceivable that there could be a co-institutor of the Blessed Sacrament? Think for a moment of applying to anyone save to Christ the things He says about the Bread from heaven in the sixth chapter of St. John. Yet these are essential to His redemption.

To turn to another relation inherent in the redemptive act, the sacrifice of Christ, like His priesthood, seems in every sense incommunicable and uniquely His. It is well enough known that in living memory not a few devout persons and theologians argued that as our Lady was the Co-redemptrix, then she must in some true sense have been a priest and have performed a specifically priestly function. Accordingly they began to spread devotion to the Virgin Priest, winning approval from the highest quarters, from Pope Pius IX and Pope Pius X. The former approved of a book written by Van den Berghe entitled *Marie et le Sacerdoce* and in a letter written 25 August, 1873, thought the title Priest was justified: "our Lady from the conception to the Cross united herself so closely to the sacrifice of her divine Son that the Fathers of the Church called her the Virgin Priest". Pius X granted an indulgence to a prayer directed to our Lady under the title Virgin Priest, and ending with the invocation: "Virgin

¹ Letter to Flavian, *Textus et Documenta*, Series theol. 9, ed. Silva-Tarouca, Romae, 1932, p. 22.

² *De Trinitate*, Bk. 8, 14, *Migne P. L.*, 10, 247.

³ *Third Synodal Letter*, n. 8. This letter enjoys unusual dogmatic authority, cf. *Franzelin* op. cit. p. 164.

Priest, pray for us." In spite, nevertheless, of such august approval, the Holy Office in 1913 proscribed pictures of our Lady in priestly vestments, in 1916 published the proscription in most solemn form, and in 1927 declared that the "devotion to the Virgin Priest" was not approved and could not be propagated. Father Hugon, who had himself written a book entitled *La Vierge Prêtre* defending the devotion, made further enquiries of the Holy Office about the matter, and received the answer, as he himself puts it, that "the Holy Office wishes there to be no further question about the Virgin Priest . . . no further explanations are to be made, for it is the wish of the Holy Office that the whole question should be laid to rest".¹

Nor is the reason for the disapproval far to seek. St. Thomas only echoes St. Paul in his Letter to the Hebrews when he reasons that to be the Redeemer is the peculiar property of Christ :

If anyone, for the redemption of something, pay a price which is not his own, but someone else's, that man is not said to redeem, but rather he is said to redeem whose possession the price is. Now the price of our redemption is the blood of Christ, or His corporal life which is meant by His blood, which Christ Himself paid. Hence both the paying of the price and the price paid belong immediately to Christ in as much as He is man . . . and hence to be the Redeemer is a peculiar property of Christ in His manhood ; although the redemption itself can be ascribed to the Trinity as to the first cause. (Q. 48, a. 5, c.)

When, therefore, our Saviour at the Last Supper said : "This is my body given for you . . . my blood shed for the remission of sins," He alone could have said those words, for only He could give what was so personally His own, and only He had the freedom to give it. Our Blessed Lady indeed had had a principal share in bringing that most sacred body into the world ; she fully assented at sore cost to herself to His self-giving to God for men, and her will was most intimately united to His, more intimately than any other could be : nevertheless it was our Saviour alone who "had power to lay down my life and power to take it up again . . . no man taketh it away from me : but I lay it down of myself". (John x, 14.) It was our Saviour's most sacred body, and His alone, which was given for us, His most precious blood, and His alone, which was shed for us. "Let them say," cries St. Leo against the Monophysites, "by what sacrifice they are reconciled, let them say by what blood they are redeemed. Who is it that *delivered himself for us an oblation and a sacrifice to God for an odour of sweetness*?"² (Eph. v, 2.) Jesus Christ alone offered the sacrifice of our ransom, and He alone is our Priest, He alone our saving victim.

If then a share in the immediate act of sacrifice is impossible to our Lady, equally impossible is an immediate share in the act of redemption itself ; for the sacrifice is the act of redemption. The Council of Trent, speaking of the Sacrifice of the Cross, says : "Our Lord and God once

¹ These facts are given with full references in Lennerz, *De Beata Virgine*, Romae, 1935, pp. 170-171 ; and in G. Friethoff, O.P., *Praelectiones de Incarnati Verbi Mysterio*, Romae, Institutum Pontificum Angelicum, 1935, pp. 316-317.

² Letter to the monks of Palestine, *Migne P. L.* 54, 1064. In fact, the words at Mass "aeterni testamenti" mean also "the everlasting bond of union" between God and man which the union of God with flesh and blood at once illustrates, causes and guarantees.

and for all by means of His death on the altar of the cross offered Himself to God the Father so that there He might accomplish eternal redemption"; and hence an exclusion from immediacy in the sacrifice excludes likewise from immediacy in the accomplishment of the redemption.

These considerations are strengthened if we consider the possibility of application to any one other than Christ of the many similitudes and analogies in which the work of redemption is pictured. "I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in me although he be dead, shall live" (John xi, 25); "I am the light of the world: he that followeth me walketh not in darkness, but shall have the light of life." (John viii, 12.) "If any man thirst, let him come to me and drink . . . now this He said of the spirit which they should receive who believed in him." (John vii, 37, 39.) "I am the vine; you the branches: he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit: for without me you can do nothing." (John xv, 5.) "As many as received him, he gave them power to be made the sons of God . . . who are born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." (John i, 12, 13.) "The Lamb that was slain . . . Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God in thy blood." (Apoc. v, 9.) "God hath given us eternal life. And this life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath life." (1 John v, 11, 12.) "Whom He predestined to be made conformable to the image of his Son: that he might be the first-born amongst many brethren." (Rom. viii, 29.) "We are his workmanship, created in Jesus Christ." (Eph. ii, 10.) "In whom all the building, being framed together, groweth up into a holy temple in the Lord, in whom you also are built together into an inhabitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. ii, 21, 22.) "As in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive." (1 Cor. xv, 22.)

It would be almost tedious to multiply the analogies under which Scripture expresses the work of redemption; but it must be obvious how very difficult it would be to apply the images to anyone save to the incarnate God. The work of redemption, or, rather, the act of redemption, is revealed to us as essentially a divine work, as divine as the act of creation; and no creature could have any immediate share in the act of creation. So, likewise, the act of redemption itself is essentially incommunicable.

This really is the point I wish to make. In what sense our Lady may be called "Co-redemptrix" is another question: whatever it may mean, it cannot mean "an immediate share in the act of redemption". Pius XI used it in a somewhat wide sense when speaking to workers for Catholic Action: "You must follow the spirit and the desire of most holy Mary, who is our Mother and Co-redemptrix; you must endeavour to make yourselves too co-redeemers and apostles, according to the spirit of Catholic Action."¹ Such a share in the work of redemption is a share in applying the fruits of the redemption Christ wrought.

¹ *Osservatore Romano*, 25 marzo, 1934.

To feel that our Lady could not immediately share in the very act of redemption is in no wise to derogate from her privilege, or from the honour and the love we bear her. It may be that our Lady's greatest joy is that our Saviour's sacrifice is unique; for the uniqueness arises from His divinity and hence enhances and does not diminish her glorious privilege of being the Mother of God, the Mother of the Saviour. A mother often rejoices that her son can do what she herself cannot do: no mother of a priest would rightly wish to have an immediate share in his priestly function of absolving from sin or of offering the holy sacrifice of the Mass. It is precisely the joy of the mother that her son can do what she by nature is unable to do, just as it is her joy that he is what she by nature is not; the greater, too, her son's act, the greater her joy. So too may we reverently think about the Mother of our one High-Priest and Saviour.

BERNARD LEEMING, S.J.

CO-OPERATION WITH NON-CATHOLICS

RECENTLY there has arisen in England a desire for greater co-operation between Catholics and non-Catholics. It is felt that we should unite our efforts to preserve the Christian nature of our civilization, to create a truly Christian social order, and, in general, work together for a better and more Christian world. The Catholic heart warms to such high and noble endeavour; the Catholic theologian knows it involves association with heretics and scents danger and difficulty. This attitude of the theologian, if left vague and confused, can cause misunderstanding: to the layman, full of the possibilities of fruitful co-operation, it can seem retrograde, unhelpful, suspicious of his zeal and enthusiasm in a good cause.

It may not then be out of place for the theologian to try to define more clearly the teaching and guidance of the Church, so that those who wish this co-operation know just where they stand, the lawful limits of their freedom, their dangers, and their safeguards.

Co-operation in Worship—"communicatio in sacris"—is treated at length in our theological text-books. But this is not quite the question at issue today. As I see it, the precise kind of co-operation visualized and contemplated at the present moment is nowhere explicitly discussed in our books of theology; we have to explore Papal documents, apply established principles, in our search for guidance. In all diffidence, therefore:

I

The Church is the one true Church. On this fact and its implications is based her teaching concerning our association with those who are separated

from her, and the question is whether, with due regard to this principle, some degree of co-operation would seem to be possible. We suggest that, within certain limits and under certain safeguards, co-operation is both lawful and permissible, and we approach this position by grouping the relevant considerations under three heads:

(1) Co-operation, to be lawful, must not be injurious to the purity and strength of the faith. Pius X in his Encyclical *Singulari Quadam* draws attention to the fact that the danger in question may arise "gradually and almost imperceptibly". It is impossible not to see that at the present time many people are tempted to put a free and non-Catholic interpretation upon dogma and moral principle. From the press, the radio, the cinema, etc., come every form of insidious and specious distortion of Christian teaching, false and misleading theories regarding morality, religion, the Natural Law, individuality, marriage, the State—dangerous and destructive ideas which infect thousands whose hold on the faith is incomplete, uninformed, and weak. If even learned theologians cannot always resist the evil influence of this unchristian atmosphere, if even educated laymen are often induced, by means of books and associates, to make dangerous concessions to the spirit of the age, or to a controlling irreligious "public opinion", it is impossible to estimate the peril threatening the less educated classes. A workman encounters it in workshop or factory, and his daily intercourse with others often affects him imperceptibly but strongly. The Church strains every nerve to protect her children, but when they join a mixed association with those not of their faith they are exposed to a much more powerful influence; they become conscious of being united with others, of being included in and subordinated to the whole, and they are apt to abandon their personal Catholic convictions and to swim with the tide, even when it threatens to take them away from the right path and to work injury to society, the Church, and themselves.

Respect for Authority is a foundation stone of Catholicism, and the Encyclical points out the danger of the exaggerated sense of personal freedom which modern ideas have evoked and which is frequently opposed to Authority. Association with non-Catholics threatens particularly to weaken Catholic reverence for authority, since in the question of Authority Catholics and Protestants differ so radically.

Other dangers to the faith of Catholics, inherent in any form of co-operation, could be enumerated and developed. We may summarize and conclude that lawful co-operation must not encourage religious indifference in any of its many and varied forms.

(2) Co-operation, to be lawful, must not lead to the error of fundamentalism. By fundamentalism we mean the false doctrine that visualizes the existence of a sort of L.C.M. of fundamental Christian doctrine common to Christians of different denominations. This fundamentalism lowers Christianity to a vague form of religion shared by Catholics and non-Catholic Christians alike; it suggests an amalgamation of various creeds;

it speaks of putting dogma in the background in favour of a "higher unity"; it believes there is such a thing as a "common Christian basis of belief". Anyone infected with this error fails to appreciate the uniqueness, the coherence, the interdependence, the unified harmony and oneness of Catholic dogma. The garment is indivisible. Hence fundamentalism, and any and every aspiration to "reunion in faith" founded upon it is condemned by the Church in *Mortalium Animos*.

Some of our doctrines may resemble the beliefs of other religions, but the resemblance is more apparent than real. The words may be the same, but the connotation of those words is very different. For instance, it is sometimes said that Catholics and Protestants have Charity in common. But their Charity is not our Charity: the words are the same, but the content is different. The Charity of Catholics is the Charity taught by Christ, truly interpreted by His Church, harmonizing with the full body of Catholic truth, conditioned by such Catholic doctrines as that of the Mystical Body, of the Real Presence, the Mass, the Sacraments. The Charity of Protestants is their own private individual interpretation of the Charity taught by Christ, in the light of their other private individual beliefs. So the word "Charity" has not the same meaning to Protestant and Catholic.¹ In like manner, neither have the words "Faith", "Christian", "Repentance", etc. There can be no real unity, agreement, in even one point of faith: between the faith of the Catholic and the belief of the heretic is set a gulf that can only be crossed by the complete submission of the heretic. And if co-operation with non-Catholics lead to any attempt to cross that gulf in any other way it stands self-condemned as unlawful.

It follows—and the conclusion is vitally important—that if co-operation there be, it cannot be founded on a "common Christian basis". We cannot work with our non-Catholic brethren on the ground that we are both Christians, or that we believe the same things. We have no common Christian ground. This conclusion must be emphasized, for in practice it is often forgotten by our non-Catholic friends, nor is it always sufficiently remembered by some of our well-meaning Catholic brethren.

If, then, co-operation which leads to fundamentalism be excluded, and if there be no common Christian basis, on what basis can we co-operate? On the basis, I think, that we have some common ends, purposes, desires, objects. There are some things for which we can strive in a common effort which leaves our dogmatic differences intact. We have some common interests which cause us to make joint endeavour while leaving us utterly

¹ The only sense in which Catholic and Protestant Charity can be said really to agree is that they can lead to the same object. By our respective Charity we can be led to desire and seek after the same thing. It is this charity of Catholic and Protestant, agreeing in the pursuit of the same good ends, that Pius XII describes as "that universal love which is the compendium and most general expression of the Christian ideal, and which therefore may serve as a common ground also for those who have not the blessing of sharing the same faith with us". Later in this article I suggest how this common ground may be expressed in practical and definite terms.

separate, distinct, and divided in our religious beliefs. My Catholic Charity leads me to want the sufferings of the poor relieved. My Protestant friend's Protestant Charity likewise leads him to want the sufferings of the poor relieved. We may therefore co-operate for this common object while differing utterly in our conception of Charity. A Catholic takes into association with non-Catholics his strong Catholic view of life and of the world, and starting with this basis, he enters into the common work of the association only to the extent permitted by his Catholic principles. If a Protestant, starting with the principles of his religion, arrives at the same demands, they may both work together for these same demands and use their combined strength to preserve moral and natural advantages without in the least abandoning their respective principles. A Catholic who has a firm hold upon his faith finds to his satisfaction that non-Catholics recognize many fundamental principles of the Natural Law, and some things demanded by Catholics. In the struggle against modern tendencies to unbelief, he can act more successfully if he allies himself with non-Catholics of this kind—perhaps he cannot act at all unless he does. It is thus that Catholics can secure the observance of Sunday, the right to Christian burial, denominational schools, the eradication of immorality, recognition and free practice of religion, respect for civil and parental authority, security in the possession and enjoyment of property, and, in general, a Christian social order and culture.

We co-operate not because we have a common faith, but because we have a common object. The distinction is critical and decisive. *Singulari Quadam* is again instructive. In referring to co-operation in economic matters between men of different denominations the Pope does not allude to the points of dogma on which they might agree, but rather to their common interest in the good order of human society (*disciplina societatis humanae*) and in the welfare of the State (*prosperitas civitatis*). It describes as the material aim they have in common some "morally permissible advantage", "the general welfare", "better conditions for the working classes", and "fairer adjustment of labour and wages". Guided then by the Encyclical we see that we can co-operate with non-Catholics for any suitable good object. What objects therefore are suitable?

(a) We may certainly work together for a better observance of the Natural Law. The Encyclical quoted points directly to the rules and aims of natural morality and natural right as suitable bases for common activity.

(b) But, beyond this, there are certain things which can be described as Christian which can be the object of joint endeavour. There are a large number of common possessions derived from the treasury of the revealed Christian religion—Christian ideas, Christian principles, Christian institutions. Foundation stones saved from the time when all men professed the same faith, they are what remains of the old faith in the fundamental dogmas of the Christian Faith, what still remains of respect and reverence for true Christianity. That the person of Christ be regarded as sacred and

protected against blasphemy, that the Bible be treated as a sacred book, that the State speak with reverence and respect of the Trinity and the Apostles' Creed, that the observance of Sunday and the great Christian feasts be enforced by law, that there be denominational schools with religious instruction, that theology be recognized as a faculty in universities, that Catholicism be officially and publicly recognized by the State—all these Christian things, these elements of the ancient common Catholic faith and more besides, Protestants no less than Catholics cling to with deep conviction, or at least with deep feelings of piety. They can therefore be an object of common action, although their precise significance, their theological nature, be differently understood by Protestant and Catholic.

It will be seen that both these groups of legitimate objects for co-operation can be described as Christian: the truths of the natural law, because Christianity first disentangled them from the errors of paganism and brought them permanently to the consciousness of the human race; the remnants of the Christian tradition, because, although now contaminated with error, they are born of the Christian revelation. And so, it is not because it is founded on a common Christian basis, but because its objects are Christian in the sense explained, that we speak of "Christian" co-operation between Catholics and non-Catholics, of a common "Christian" front, a united "Christian" effort, etc. The use of the word "Christian" is justified because the object of the co-operation is Christian.

(3) Lastly, co-operation with non-Catholics, to be lawful, must be undertaken and conducted in obedience to the Church. The Church requires that all reasonable precautions be taken to remove the manifold dangers of such co-operation—especially the dangers we have indicated, of indifference and fundamentalism. Pius X in permitting Catholics in Germany to co-operate with non-Catholics in mixed labour unions does so on two conditions. First he requires that Catholics who join such unions be specially trained to think and act in accordance with Catholic principles. He suggests that this formation can be given by affiliating such Catholics with Catholic associations of working men directed by priests; these associations can give them the right principles and suitable instruction "to enable them to take part in the work of labour unions in the right way and according to Catholic principles". The second condition is that such co-operation be subject to the careful vigilance of the bishops. It is of course impossible here to discuss in its practical aspects the pastoral duty imposed on bishops of seeing that all precautions against the dangers of co-operation be taken and function. But it is obvious that the vigilance enjoined is not merely negative (a "watching brief"), but involves positive steps to see that Catholics taking part are fitted and suitably trained, that the co-operation is limited according to its necessity, usefulness, desirability; that the form it should take, the scope of its object, the condition of such association, etc., be clearly defined. At the same time, vigilance does not mean oppressive domination.

II

We may summarize what we have written in the form of practical conclusions to guide our future efforts at co-operation.

(1) There can be no co-operation in worship, no "communicatio in sacris", no such attempt at "reunion in faith" as is condemned in *Mortalium Animos*. But such co-operation is not visualized at the present moment.

(2) There can be no co-operation which may lead to fundamentalism, indifferentism, or weakening of the purity and strength of the faith.

(3) There can be no co-operation on a so-called "common Christian basis". What has been said, and, from another angle, the teaching of *Mortalium Animos*, make it abundantly clear that no such common basis does or can exist. What we may appear to have in common is not Catholic, and in any case is far too elusive to form any practical basis for common action. We must put away any idea of joining with non-Catholics as Christians, or of working with men who have the same or similar beliefs as ourselves. The true faith can have nothing in common with heresy.

(4) The only basis for co-operation is that Catholics and non-Catholics can work together for certain common objects which they both desire. On this basis of common interest we may co-operate to promote a more perfect observance of the Natural Law and to preserve certain Christian ideas, principles, institutions, beneficial to Catholics and non-Catholics alike.¹ Such co-operation is lawful on two conditions. First, its manifest dangers must be effectively guarded against. To this end Pius X would seem to direct that Catholics who take part in such co-operation should themselves be organized to receive the necessary Catholic formation and guidance from Ecclesiastical Authority.² Secondly, Catholic bishops must exercise adequate and positive vigilance over such co-operation.

With these safeguards and for such objects co-operation between Catholics and non-Catholics is lawful.

Is it necessary? In England we profess to have put our hand to the creation of a new world order founded on Christian principles. We cannot do this alone. The lesson of the past is that a purely Catholic effort is unequal to the task.

Is it practicable? Many of our bishops, with Cardinal Hinsley at their head, seem to think so.

W. BUTTERFIELD.

¹ In THE CLERGY REVIEW of February, 1942, Dr. Mahoney writes: "Collaboration with non-Catholics is, therefore, desired by the Holy See. . . purely within the sphere of the natural law, particularly in its social applications as taught during the last fifty years in a series of papal encyclicals." It seems to me, however, that co-operation to secure the aims I have mentioned above, aims which surely transcend the scope of the natural law, is not excluded from the intention of the Holy See.

² Hence co-operation with non-Catholics can never be a purely lay undertaking.

HOMILETICS

The Fourth Sunday after Easter

"When He, the Spirit of Truth, is come, He will teach you all truth." (John xvi, 13.)

BY the Incarnation of the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, His life and sufferings and death, atonement has been made for original sin and Heaven has been opened again to man to whom is now restored, through that sacrament of incorporation with Christ which we call Baptism, the supernatural elevation bestowed in the beginning upon his first parents. Man has in the very truest sense been recreated: the human race has begun again under a new Head: a Second Adam has stepped into the place of the first, "blotting out the handwriting of the decree that was against us" because of him: and from this Second Adam we derive not merely such a material existence as we owe to the first, but a new life of divine quality by which we are adopted into the sonship of God the Father with all the rights and privileges and expectations that are the portion of sons. We are, as St. Augustine puts it, introduced into the very family of the Blessed Trinity, for the life that the Son has brought us and that we now live is His very own, and we are empowered to say boldly "I live, now not I, but Christ liveth in me"; my life is in the eyes of God the Father the life not of a mere creature but of a son—of His only begotten Son. We are the sons of God: by adoption, indeed, because we are not of the divine nature, yet truly and not in any metaphorical or otherwise qualified sense.

The possession of this life is our guarantee of salvation, of which we are assured if we preserve and foster it. Christ is the Life and the Truth, and He is also the Way. What He has brought us He also teaches us how to understand and how to use. But it is not a mere code, a theory, a profession that He has given us, it is something to be *done*: not a matter of knowledge alone, but a matter of action and attainment, something that we have both to do and to be. The work, then, must proceed from within, for it is possible to see the truth and admire the beauty of what is set before us and yet to remain uninfluenced by them in mind or heart. This inner illumination and inspiration is the work of the Holy Ghost Who is present in our souls as truly, though not after the same manner, as Christ is present in the consecrated species upon the altar. He it is Who "convinces us of sin and of justice and of judgement", showing us these as Christ sees them: He it is Who brings home to us, not as mere speculative truths but as integral and vital principles of thought and estimate and action, all things whatsoever Christ has said to us. All God-ward enlightenments of mind and stirrings of will, all impulses to reject falsehood and evil and to cleave to truth and goodness, all movements to repentance and amendment, all aspiration after the better and nobler and higher things, all grasp of the grounds of perseverance and recovery and attainment, proceed from the active operation of the Holy Ghost labouring in our souls that Christ may be formed in us and that we may be in very fact, as we are by title, other Christs.

Thus it was expedient that the human figure of Christ should go from amongst men, for if He went not and we were to have Him always physically in our sight, it might be that the very surpassing perfection of His example would set a barrier between Him and ourselves, as when Peter, roused by a striking manifestation of His divine power, cried out in fear, "Depart from me for I am a sinful man!" But now, though gone from before our eyes, He is the more truly, because the more intimately and divinely, present to us in His Spirit, dwelling and working inside our own being to bring it "unto the measure of the stature of His fullness".

The Fifth Sunday after Easter

"Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee." (Luke i, 28.)

The whole Christian endeavour is summed up in the effort to live the Christ life. The "germ", so to call it, of that life has been inserted into our souls by Baptism: it is for us, under the prompting of the Holy Ghost, to tend and foster the germ until it spreads throughout our whole being, making us more and more conformable to the image of Christ, the only-begotten Son of the Father with Whom, as the Spirit testifieth, being adopted-sons of the same Father, we are joint-heirs. This inward work of "Christ-ening" is, as we know, the mission of the Holy Ghost to our souls, and it is His aid that we must implore and with His stirring that we must co-operate. But in addition to this, complementary to it, we have need (not an absolute need, but still a very real practical one) of the aid and intercession on our behalf of someone purely of our own stock in whom we know that that task was accomplished to perfection. And just as the Church has selected from among the saints certain patrons, protectors, intercessors for those still upon earth with whom their own earth-life had some special affinity, so she offers us in Our Blessed Lady the supreme patroness of holiness under *all* circumstances, since under all circumstances holiness means the mystical growth within us of that Christ whose mother she is and who was subject to her, as the Gospel tells us, from infancy to full manhood.

In so doing the Church is only implementing the commission given by Christ Himself from the Cross that we should take her as our mother—the mother, namely, of the mystical Christ-self that each of us acquires in Baptism—and she take our new selves as her children to teach and guard and care for now in the spirit as she had taught and guarded and cared for Him then in the flesh. You may call her the Patroness of the Christ-life, which she is not by appointment merely, like the saints, but of her own right just because she is what she is. For it is implicit in the unique privilege of her Immaculate Conception that hers was the one purely human soul in which God had from first to last His unrestricted way; that her meet, like His, was to do the will of God; and that like Him she did always what was pleasing to the Father. She who, as St. Leo says, conceived Christ first in her mind before she conceived Him in her body, who tended Him through His years of infancy and adolescence, and who was witness of all the vicissitudes of His public life, of His ignominy and of His glory, is surely qualified in a manner and degree impossible in any other human being to stand

patron and intercessor before the Father of our endeavour to live the new life of her Son that is now our own life and so to be made worthy of the promises of Christ. Her word to all Christians is still "Whatsoever He shall say to you, do ye": and it is through her intercession that, according as we on our part are faithful to the stirring of the Holy Ghost of Whom she conceived Christ her Son Our Lord, we learn more and more certainly what it is that He would have us to do and how we are to do it, so that with the same Christ mystically conceived in our souls we also may grow and come to maturity.

Sunday within the Octave of the Ascension

"They will put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth a service to God." (John xvi, 2.)

"If any man will come after me," said Our Lord, "let him take up his cross and follow me." If we analyse these words we find in them an invitation to make a free choice of identifying ourselves with Christ: a clear statement that this choice can be realized only at the price of rejecting all else but Him, for the Cross stands for the negation of every worldly aim and satisfaction and is the symbol ("to the Jews a scandal, to the Greeks folly") of the voluntary renunciation of all such: and lastly, a warning that in fact to follow Christ, to try to mould our lives upon His, must inevitably bring us into collision with what the rest of the world with whom we live holds dearest and most desirable. There is no blinking the fact: you cannot be a true Christian in the real sense of the word and be at the same time acceptable to the world in general. This one can indeed easily understand, for the most casual acquaintance with the spirit and principles of Christ shows that they are essentially at odds with those of what we call the world. If that were all, it would not matter very much: we should anyhow take it for granted. But it is otherwise when we discover that in the Christian body itself there is a like division, that there are those who in the very name of Christianity stand opposed to the wholehearted practice of it to which we have just referred. Such as these are willing to salute the saints from afar and therewith to pay at least lip-service to "holiness" as distinguished from mere ordinary "goodness". But when it comes (as, in the light of Our Lord's repeated exhortation, it surely does come) to maintaining that holiness is an objective positively prescribed by Him for *all* His followers, and that in fact a Christian belies his profession in so far as he does not aim at that, they are scandalized, they think it folly. Not indeed out of hostility to the ideals of their Faith, but in their interest. "They will put you out of the synagogues," says Our Lord in today's Gospel, speaking to the inner circle of His followers, "yea, the hour cometh that whosoever killeth you will think that he doth a service to God"—which in its modern equivalent is translated into a mental attitude of irritated criticism, of uneasy disapproval, finding expression at times in something not far short of downright persecution. For long-ingrained habit, second-rate example in quarters which should be first-rate, ill-written lives of the saints, the multiplication of fussy and trivial devotions, aided by a natural enough tendency

towards smoothing and softening what is felt to be rough and hard and uncompromising in the Christian plan of life, have led to a dilution of its ideals with all sorts of worldly and prudential elements, and there has resulted a stubborn "mediocrity-complex" in the mind of the average practising Christian. The outcome of this is a rooted incredulity amongst us as to the possibility for the great majority of us of any intimate following of Christ, and a consequent resentment against those who believe otherwise.

No doubt one could assign many very just reasons to account for the evil state of the world at large, of which the present war is one obvious outcome: but first and most radical of all is this, that it is so because the Christian profession which could and would preserve it from corruption is not given the chance of doing its work: to put it more concretely, it is because so few of us are saints; and so few of us are saints because so many of us, being victims of inferior spiritual ideals, have become content to live out our lives on a low spiritual level and neither hope nor believe that we ever *could* be saints. Yet the Paraclete, the Inspirer and Strengtheners, has taken up His dwelling in each of us precisely that He should give testimony of Christ within us, should move and urge us "with unutterable groanings" to aim no lower than at the highest and to be content with nothing less than the best—"When you shall have done all these things that are commanded you, say 'We are unprofitable servants, we have done that which we ought to do.'" Nor is He there to urge us only, but also to lend the aid of His creative power to every sincere effort that we make to correspond with His impulse and so, as St. Peter says, "to make sure our calling and election".

Whitsunday

"And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii, 4.)

It is narrated in the nineteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles that St. Paul, coming to Ephesus, found there a number of persons who had received the Baptism of John and believed in Christ. He asked them whether they had received the Holy Ghost, and they replied, "We have not so much as heard whether there be a Holy Ghost."

One certainly would not expect just that answer from any baptized Christian today: but it is not so certain that were one to ask "What do you believe about the Holy Ghost? What do you understand His office to be? What does He mean to you practically in your daily life?" one would get from everyone a fully satisfactory reply. We all believe, of course, in the existence of the Holy Ghost, the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, and we invoke His name every time that we make the sign of the Cross: but one has known devout Christians who, while giving to all the articles of the Faith the fullest and most sincere assent of mind and will, would yet confess their incomprehension of His functions in their regard. Yet it is not too much to say that one who hoped to understand the spiritual life or even to grasp the true significance of religion, without reckoning with the activity of the Holy Ghost, would be like a medical student expecting to explore satisfactorily the constitution and operations of the human body while taking no account of the heart or the brain.

What Catholic theology teaches is that from the Father, the self-existent First Cause of all, and the Son, His Word, His self-idea, equal in nature with Himself, there proceeds a mutual Love completely adequate to its Object and therefore also equal in nature with the Father and the Son, Who is denominated the "Spirit" from the metaphor of a "breathing out", as it were, of a sigh of complete fullness of content. This is the Third Person, the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Divine Love : and as love is the principle of action, moving the will in its necessary reaching out to the "good", it is permissible to conceive of the Holy Ghost as God under the aspect (for want of a better word) of *activity*—as "God acting". Now the whole Universe, which to us seems to be fixed, finished, and stable, is in fact, in all the details of its being, something that God is even now doing, something even now *being* done by Him, as the song is something that is being done by the singer. "Of Him and by Him and in Him," says St. Paul, "are all things"—of the Father from Whom comes all existence, absolutely : *by* (or through) the Son in Whom is, as it were, the "pattern" of all reality and possibility : *in* the Holy Ghost, Who vivifies and governs all that comes from the Father through the Son. It does look, then, as though to ignore, or indeed not to make very much of, the Holy Ghost were an extremely serious error. For this which is true of all creation is true in a very special, and very specially forceful, manner of the souls of the just—of those who are, as we say, in a state of grace. In them the Holy Ghost, the very Power of God which no evil can withstand nor weakness obstruct, is present and is at their disposal to be drawn upon inexhaustibly as they have need of it in order to fulfil His will. If only more often we called upon Him, in Our Lord's own words "with faith believing", with daring and confidence, who would venture to set any bounds to what we might achieve for ourselves and for all the world besides ? *Veni Creator Spiritus, mentes Tuorum visita, imple superna gratia quæ Tu creasti pectora.*

Trinity Sunday

"We will come to him and will make our abode with him." (John xiv, 23.)

What has been said of the irresponsiveness or perplexity of the average Christian in regard to the existence and office of the Holy Ghost might be said with perhaps even more justice of their reaction to the mystery of the Blessed Trinity. This dogma of the Faith is, of course, a mystery in the strictest sense of the word : we know of it by revelation alone, and the mind can do no more than supply us with symbols and similes and analogies concerning it which may help us, not to understand the mystery, but to apply the fact of it to broadening and clarifying our knowledge of God, narrow and obscure though that must still always remain. But what we must *not* do if our spiritual life is to have any true vigour and unity is (with whatever awe and reverence) to regard the Mystery of the Blessed Trinity as something standing in isolation from the practical side of that life. It is indeed noticeable in all the saints of whose inner life we have been permitted by their biographers to have an unedited version, that as they grew in holiness so did they tend to concentrate more and more exclusively upon

this sovereign Mystery in which seemed to be absorbed, and by that absorption intensified and elevated, all other devotional attractions. This fact seems reasonable enough, indeed inevitable, if we reflect that when we say "growth in holiness" we mean the subjective aspect of closer union with God and intenser content in Him: for the Mystery of the Blessed Trinity is the definition of His life and being and therefore represents the ever increasingly clearer goal of their desire.

But it has been truly said that every Christian is, by the very fact, "the beginning of a saint": so that we are unfaithful to our characters as such in the proportion that we neglect to take this Mystery into personal and practical account. We are familiar with the doctrine of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost in our souls, and most of us will no doubt acknowledge some intimate experience of its effects. But though the Church appropriates this indwelling to the Third Person as she does, for instance, creation to the First, her main object in this special attribution is to help us to some sort of *realization* of the distinction that exists between the three Divine Persons Who none the less are one and the same God, since that distinction must in itself elude our finite comprehension, and she insists no less definitely that the indivisible God is wholly in all His actions. So that we are not only entitled but obliged to believe that it is the Blessed Trinity itself that enters and makes Its abode in our souls. Our minds may well stagger at the thought. Somehow, within the confines of my being the Triune Life of God circulates: the Son being generated by the Father, the Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father and the Son. The Power and Eternity of the Father, the Wisdom and Beauty of the Son, the Love of the Holy Ghost, all, in a manner passing speech or comprehension but none the less as truly as the truth of God's very existence, all within me and around me, encompassing me and drawing me into Themselves. It fills one with reverence and love for one's fellowmen: it makes one almost afraid of one's own self: it lets one understand how to the saints there seemed to be nothing in all the world but only God: it gives one a glimpse of the far-away and yet unguessed happiness to come, "when the dawn breaks and shadows flee away" and "we shall see face to face and shall know even as we are known".

R. H. J. STEUART, S.J.

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

I. DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

WE have received the first of three volumes destined to give a complete English version of de la Taille's monumental work *Mysterium Fidei*.¹ These volumes, unlike other books which have already made

¹ *The Mystery of Faith*. By Maurice de la Taille, S.J. Book I: The Sacrifice of Our Lord. (Sheed & Ward. Pp. xi + 255. Price 10s. 6d. net.)

fairly well known to English readers the teaching of the great Jesuit theologian on the sacrifice of the Mass, are not to be simply a popular and abridged version, but "the work itself, every line and every footnote". And in fact it is only after having so read the book, "the work itself, every line and every footnote", that one is able to appraise it justly. Fully conscious that his views were likely to arouse some antagonism as soon as his readers had reached the tenth page of a volume containing no fewer than 664 pages, the author pleaded in his preface that he should not be condemned until the book had been read in its entirety. A re-reading of the still interesting controversies which raged over *Mysterium Fidei* on its first appearance twenty-three years ago makes one doubt whether the author received from all his opponents that fair and complete hearing for which he asked. We are inclined to think that full justice was done, not merely to the famous "theory" but to the book as a whole, only when the early fever of controversy had abated and when responsible theologians of the first order had been able to devote to the work that thorough study and unbiased consideration which so notable a contribution to theological research had the right to demand. It was then seen that this was not merely another theory on the sacrifice of the Mass. It was a treatise of theology with the Mass at its centre. And those who studied it carefully, whether they agreed with the author's theory or not, could not but acknowledge—what in reading it again we have come to appreciate more fully than before—that every page betrays the hand of a theological master. Wide erudition, profound reverence for the Word of God, depth of thought, breadth of vision, sobriety of statement and meticulous precision of language—all are apparent throughout, and seldom, if ever, is he found wanting in any of these characteristics of the ideal theologian. Not the least attractive feature of de la Taille's mastery of his subject is his fascinating gift of digression, the offspring of a wide theological learning, mated perhaps with a professor's experience in dealing with red herrings. This is why his footnotes are so important and why in any translation of the work their omission would detract so much from its interest and value. At no moment does the author suffer us to leave the main path of his argument, which, clearly indicated in the early pages, leads logically and unswervingly to its conclusion. But our guide is so sure of his path, and so confident that we are following his lead, that he feels free to point down the by-paths at theological splendours of which for the moment we are afforded only a glimpse. Original Sin, the Incarnation, the Redemption, Grace, Merit, Satisfaction, the Mystical Body, Our Blessed Lady, the Immaculate Conception, the Sacraments in general, and many other dogmas are treated briefly in these invaluable notes—briefly, yet with such penetration that we are left with a lasting regret that Père de la Taille was not spared for many years more, so that other parts of theology, besides the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, might have been enriched by the work of his genius.

We approach, with some reluctance, a consideration of the English version before us. We feel bound to say at once that both the excellence of de la Taille's work and the courageous enterprise of the publishers merited to be better served. One might have hoped that a translation of *Mysterium Fidei* would prove to be a valuable addition, if not to English theological thought, at least to our theological literature. It was perhaps

too much to hope. The Latin of our scholastic theologians, for the most part terse and severe, carrying conviction to the mind with its directness and lucidity rather than appealing to the fantasy with the eloquence of imagery, does not fall easily into readable English. Moreover the Latin of Père de la Taille, while we might hesitate to agree with the publishers' announcement that it is "appallingly difficult", has enough pretensions to a certain elegance to call for some manipulation before it can be rendered into our language. The task of translation is made more difficult still by the absolute need, in a work of this kind, of a scientific precision which will be beyond cavil. Thus in a theological treatise "actual" does not mean the same as "real"; "absolutely" does not mean the same as "completely"; "exhibit" does not mean the same as "give". A scrupulous exactitude of expression, which in casual conversation would be rightly dubbed as pedantry, in a theological work is *de rigueur*, and those slight and harmless exaggerations, without which a pleasing human intercourse is well-nigh impossible, are unpardonable in the theological expert. We have perhaps said enough to show that we do not underate the formidable character of the task that faced the translator of *Mysterium Fidei*; enough also to forestall any surprise if it has proved too much for him.

Having read this translation not without some familiarity with the original work and the main thesis of the author, nor—let it be candidly confessed—without some peeps at the Latin to refresh the memory, we find it a matter of difficulty to assess its effect upon one who approaches the book with a virgin mind. After careful consideration we are inclined to think that he would (1) form a fairly clear idea of the author's doctrine on sacrifice in general and propitiatory sacrifice in particular, on the two elements (oblation and immolation) that are essential in propitiatory sacrifice, and on the relation between the Last Supper and Christ's death on the Cross; (2) he would be able, though here and there with some difficulty, to follow the greater part of his theological reasoning; (3) he would be impressed by the author's learning and erudition. But on the other hand we think it only fair to surmise that (1) he would find the book difficult to read; (2) he would be led to think some of the arguments—not through the author's fault—inconclusive; (3) he would find some of the statements in the book—again without any fault of the author—almost unintelligible; and (4) he would, not through any fault of his own, miss some of the finer points of the author's argument.

In support of this judgement, especially the latter part of it, some evidence ought to be given. Here are a very few examples:

Further, it not only implies impenetration for pardon, namely, pardon received through petition, but it also implies that, pardon being granted and no other obstacle to the influx of goodness and favour towards men being placed, other benefits besides pardon are obtained from God (p. 12.)

Hence rebel or sinful flesh is not of itself capable of subjecting the soul in a connatural manner, so as to turn it to God (p. 37, n. 12).

Understand clearly that we are not discussing the psychological freedom of Christ, that is His mental capability of making or not making a free choice. We are speaking simply of His moral freedom. In other words, admit in Christ the obligation to submit to death, admit also the absolute sinlessness of Christ, we are not here discussing His power of choice apart from any psychological necessity. We ask merely: was Christ under this obligation to die, and how and whence? (p. 125, n. 1). (Here a peep at the Latin is surely permissible):

Adverte, prudens lector, hic minime disputari de libertate psychologica Christi, sed solummodo de libertate morali. Non quaeritur scilicet quomodo obligationi moriendi (semel admissae) coexistit in Christo (absolute impeccabili) respectu mortis eligendae, potestas se determinandi absque ulla necessitate psychologica. Quaeritur solum subiacueritne Christus tali obligationi moriendi, et quomodo, et unde. (M.F. p. 93, n. 1).

And here is an astounding statement :

Theologians have always realized that such a sacrifice, in this strict acceptance, was the foundation of speculative theology . . . (pp. 32-33),

which, as a glance at the Latin shows,

Quod sacrificium, nullatenus metaphoricum . . . sed prorsus . . . severe accipiendum . . . nemo, praesertim ex proceribus rerum theologiarum, iudicaverit unquam ad portandam fabricam speculationis theologicae ineptum. . . . (M.F. pp. 22-23),

Père de la Taille never made.

Nor, apparently, is it the Latin of Père de la Taille alone that presents difficulties to the translator, since canon 1 of the 22nd session of the Council of Trent,

Si quis dixerit . . . quod offerri non sit aliud quam nobis Christum ad manducandum dari : A.S.

is thus rendered in the English version :

If anyone says . . . that what is offered is other than Christ gave us to be eaten ; A.S. (p. 21).

In writing of Père de la Taille we mentioned among the qualities of the ideal theologian that of sobriety of statement—a quality which we seek in vain in an article by Fr. Raymond O'Flynn appearing in the January 1942 issue of the *Catholic Gazette*. It bears the arresting title, "The Insufficiency of Thomism" and is described by the Editor as "a carefully reasoned plea for the supplementing of the Thomistic Philosophy by the other schools of Scholasticism, especially the Franciscan School most notably represented by St. Bonaventure and Scotus". It is far from our intention to suggest that the philosophical teaching of St. Thomas should not be supplemented, where possible, by that of the two great luminaries of the Franciscan Order ; as it must also be far from the intention of Fr. O'Flynn to advocate the abolition of Thomism from the Catholic schools. Indeed the writer of the article in his last paragraph emphatically disclaims any such desire : "Are we," he writes, "to banish St. Thomas from the Schools? God forbid!" Nevertheless this belated disclaimer is powerless to dispel the impression created by two pages of somewhat desultory criticism which represent Thomistic philosophy as from nearly every point of view undesirable. Purely philosophical comment on this criticism is beyond the scope of one who writes, as we do in these pages, from the theological point of view ; such comment may be left—should he think fit to make it—to the contributor who periodically records recent philosophical trends in THE CLERGY REVIEW. What we are concerned, in more senses than one, to notice is the striking contrast between the view taken by Fr. O'Flynn of

the Thomistic philosophy and the view not only taken but also publicly and solemnly propounded in one Encyclical after another by recent Popes. We need no reminding of the axiom quoted at the end of the article under review: "Locus ab auctoritate infirmisissimus." This axiom does not hold in theology. The theologian's chief argument is the argument from authority, the authority of God and the authority of the Church. At the same time we are not so unsophisticated as to imagine that any Papal pronouncements upon the Thomistic philosophy are able, or are intended, as such to define any theses of that philosophy as dogmas of faith. What is undeniable, however, is that it is within the infallible competence of the Church to determine whether a particular philosophy, in its spirit, its point of view and basic principles, is in conformity with the Catholic faith. It is also undeniable that the Holy See has solemnly and repeatedly affirmed this in regard to the philosophy of St. Thomas.

In the light of these pronouncements many of Fr. O'Flynn's statements are surprising. It is possible—and the number of misprints in the article makes it appear likely—that the article was written in haste; in which case we may suppose that some of the more violent criticisms which the writer levels at the philosophy of St. Thomas are in intention directed at the unpurged philosophy of Aristotle. If this is so the consideration of them remains a matter of pure philosophy, with which we have here no immediate concern. But we can only take Fr. O'Flynn's statements as they stand. And as they stand theologians will find many of them, as we have said, surprising.

It is almost treason nowadays (he writes) to question St. Thomas, so firmly has he established himself in the usage of the Schools. His is the type of philosophy which is readily grasped by minds habituated to the mathematical and physical levels, and is eminently serviceable in dealing with the "rationalist" similarly habituated. But it is a philosophy pagan in spirit, and does not easily blend in the synthesis of Christian thought.

In the first place it is not exact to say that St. Thomas has "established himself in the usage of the Schools". He has been established there by the authority of the Holy See, and the repeated prescriptions of the Popes on the subject¹ have been enshrined in the Canon Law of the Church.² Moreover, as a study of the said documents shows, it is precisely because the philosophy of St. Thomas is *not* pagan in spirit and because it *does* easily blend in the synthesis of Christian thought that the Church, in the words of Pius XI, "has adopted his doctrine for her own".³ "We are convinced, in common with Our predecessors," wrote Benedict XV, "that We need concern ourselves only with that philosophy which is according to Christ and that consequently We are bound to insist on a philosophy according to the principles and method of Aquinas."⁴ His immediate predecessor had already said that "the principles of philosophy laid down by St. Thomas Aquinas are to be religiously and inviolably observed, because they are the means of acquiring a knowledge of created things most harmonious with the Faith, of refuting all the errors of all ages, and of enabling

¹ Cf. Leo XIII *Aeterni Patris*, 4 August, 1879; Pius X, *Sacrorum Antistitum*, 1 September, 1910; *Doctoris Angelici*, 29 June, 1914; Pius XI *Studiorum duces*, 29 June, 1923.

² C. 1366, 2.

³ *Studiorum duces*.

⁴ *Motu Proprio*, *Non Multo*, 31 December, 1914.

man to distinguish clearly what things are to be attributed to God and to God alone".¹

With this estimate of the philosophical principles of St. Thomas Fr. O'Flynn does not appear to agree: "Because St. Thomas," he writes, "in deference to Aristotle, did not acknowledge the universality of 'prime matter', his tendency is to enhance the creature at the expense of the Creator." His angelology, moreover, "verges very closely, to say the least, on the pantheism he was at pains to refute". Having thus reproached St. Thomas with attenuating the difference between God and creatures, Fr. O'Flynn is surely guilty of some inconsistency when, in the next paragraph, he remarks disapprovingly on the Angelic Doctor's failure to emphasize the likeness between them: "He is familiar as a Christian with Divine Exemplarism—he recognizes vestiges and images of the Creator in His production. But . . . while St. Thomas recognizes 'analogy', implying a similarity as well as a difference, characteristically it is the difference he stresses." Curiously, it is for the exactness of his teaching on this very point that St. Thomas is singled out for special praise by Pope Pius X: "They (i.e. the philosophical principles of St. Thomas) marvellously illustrate both the diversity and the analogy existing between God and His works, a diversity and analogy admirably expressed by the Fourth Lateran Council in these words: 'The similarity to be observed between the Creator and the creature is not so great, that we must not notice between them a greater dissimilarity still.'"²

Neither space nor the scope of these Notes allows us to follow Fr. O'Flynn through his enumeration of the grave disadvantages which are to be feared from adopting the "spirit" and the "point of view" of the Thomistic philosophy. His criticisms of that philosophy coincide with the criticisms which St. Bonaventure directed against the pagan philosophy of Aristotle, and they may be found fully developed in M. Gilson's magisterial study of St. Bonaventure's thought. The alarm which this great philosopher and mystic felt at the proposed adaptation of Aristotelian principles to the defence and systematization of Catholic theology proved subsequently to be groundless, though there was ample reason for his uneasiness at the time. Were the Seraphic Doctor alive today he would be the first to acclaim the triumph of the Thomistic synthesis, the first to applaud the wisdom of the Holy See in proposing the philosophy of St. Thomas as the safe and sure guide for students of Catholic theology. If he felt any uneasiness at all today it would perhaps be lest the Platonism which in his skilful hands provided the framework of a sound philosophy of Christian mysticism might prove a danger in the hands of inexperienced exponents. None more than he would have deprecated the use, or rather the abuse, which the Ontologists made of his writings.

It is undoubtedly the wish of the Holy See that the philosophical teaching of St. Thomas should be supplemented by all that is good and desirable in the teaching of other Scholastic Doctors—supplemented but not supplanted. On this we have the definite warning of Pope Pius X: "Because We stated (in the Letter *Sacrorum Antistitum*) that the philosophy of Aquinas was to be followed chiefly, though not exclusively, certain persons persuaded

¹ *Doctoris Angelici.*

² *Ibid.*

themselves that they were acting in accordance with Our will or at any rate not opposing it, if they adopted indiscriminately the philosophical views held by some one of the scholastic Doctors, even though such views might be contrary to the principles of St. Thomas. In this they were deceived."¹ What exactly the "principles" of St. Thomas are the Church has not thought it necessary to determine; they are set forth in his writings, and therefore accessible to our investigation. It is not the function of the Church to teach us philosophy. She is content to guide us to where a safe philosophy may be found.

The article which has been the occasion of these remarks has led us to emphasize the merits of St. Thomas in the field of philosophy at the apparent expense of other giants of Scholasticism. Their merits, for not being stressed in these pages, are not denied. To deny them would be to contradict the utterances of the very Popes who have singled out St. Thomas as the prince of the Scholastics. In the very true words of Fr. O'Flynn, "St. Thomas himself would be the last to claim that Thomism should be identified with Scholasticism." Nevertheless Bishop Hedley gives a juster appreciation of the attitude of the Church when, commenting upon the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, he writes: "The Pope, it is true, will not reject what is rightly and wisely said, by whomsoever said. But to use this as an argument that he recommends Catholic philosophy to take the lantern of the eclectic and wander about the earth in search of teachers, accepting a dole of truth from each, would be to stultify the Pope, and to make the Encyclical well-nigh idle words. There may be an apple here and there on many a tree of the orchard, and even beyond its bounds, but the Sovereign Pontiff desires his children to shake one particular tree. Life is short, questions are many, unity is absolutely essential, a few minor mistakes are no great matter. Therefore, we are to go to St. Thomas."

G. D. SMITH.

II. PHILOSOPHY

The Gifford Foundation for lectures in Natural Theology has produced much work of first-rate and lasting importance, and much that is stimulating and provocative of thought or even of resentment. According to the terms of Lord Gifford's bequest the discussions are to be kept strictly to the sphere of reason, without finding any of their "reasons" in faith. This clear recognition of the distinction between the spheres of reason and faith is most valuable, and is the first essential step on the road to unifying them, as Maritain has shown in his work on the Degrees of Being. We need only recall, for example, the two groups of lectures by Prof. James Ward on *Naturalism and Agnosticism* and on *The Realm of Ends*, Prof. Sorley's *Moral Values and the Idea of God*, or Prof. Taylor's *The Faith of a Moralist*, to realize how much solid and permanent work this lectureship has produced. These are examples taken at random, and apart from them and others of like quality, many of the courses of lectures have been of great value in provoking thought and discussion on this fundamental subject. Such lectures have an

¹ *Doctoris Angelici.*

astrigent character, and it is among these that the latest series by Prof. John Laird¹ is to be reckoned. On the main subject of the lectures, namely God, Prof. Laird does not arrive at any very definite conclusions, but in the course of the inquiry he discusses with great penetration and lucidity several highly important philosophical problems. Clarity and charm of style are, superficially, the most striking features of this second series, as they were of the first; and these are most valuable qualities in the presentation of this abstruse subject.

The first part of the present series is devoted to an inquiry into the author's version of realism; which had been assumed as a working hypothesis in the first series of lectures. The second part of the book is concerned with the discussion of various reputed attributes of God, and the moral proofs of Theism. The name chosen for this series, *Mind and Deity*, is thus exceedingly apt.

It is impossible not to feel while reading this work that Prof. Laird is much more interested in the first of these subjects than in the second. Indeed, when speaking about God his manner is so detached that one receives the impression that it is no great matter whether God exists or not, though discussion of the question can provide quite good entertainment, and enable one to forget the war.

As was pointed out in this REVIEW in the notice of the first volume of this series of lectures, there are two presuppositions adopted by Prof. Laird which govern, and, it seems, impair the whole outlook and treatment of the subject. The first, and less vital, is that the word Theism is taken to cover "any theory that there is a God or gods in any intelligible sense"; and would therefore include, among many other theories, Pantheism. In this case we shall have to find some other name for what has always and everywhere been known as Theism; but Prof. Laird's usage makes for confusion when he is dealing with such divine attributes as Providence, which can hardly have an intelligible sense in a Pantheistic system. Prof. Laird goes so far as to assert that every theist who does not believe in a finite God is a Pantheist; which certainly solves this most thorny question of Pantheism, but only by denying its existence.

The second governing presupposition of these lectures is concerned with the analogy of being. It is assumed throughout that the terms existence and reality are synonymous; and that existence is univocal and admits of no degrees, so that a thing either is or is not—its existence is just existence without any qualification such as substantial or accidental, participated or unparticipated. If this be taken for granted it will be plainly impossible to distinguish between the being of the Creator and that of the creature, and any attempt to arrive at the existence of the former "from the visible things of the world" by means of any kind of cosmological argument is foredoomed to failure. In the first series therefore all such arguments were pronounced non-conclusive, and in this second series the Ontological Argument also is dismissed as "a sham". The author holds that Kant detected the fallacy in the argument when he said that existence is not a real predicate, since it does not tell us anything about God. This, indeed, is an obscure way of stating the fallacy, but it must be said that on Prof. Laird's assumption of the univocity of being not only this argument but every attempt

¹ *Mind and Deity*. By John Laird. (George Allen and Unwin. 10s. 6d. net.)

to correlate value and existence will be illusory. The problem of their relationship, or lack of it, is discussed in Lecture VII of the present series where the consequences of this fundamental position are made very plain.

From this Lecture VII we take two examples of the author's view of "existence". "As I have already observed on several occasions 'to be' means quite simply *to be*. It can be truly asserted wherever it is true to say 'There is', and that statement means neither more nor less than what it says. If any addition is made to the meaning of the verb, the addition really is an addition." Again "I do not think it legitimate to distinguish between being and existence." It seems to be forgotten that it is never possible to assert "There is" in vacuo, but only in the concrete. "Existence," Prof. Laird contends, "is not a characterizing property of any real being", and therefore cannot be connected with any property of an existent, such as truth, beauty or goodness. *Omne ens est verum, pulchrum, bonum* is fallacious.

It is not surprising that with these foundations the only God with which Prof. Laird can supply us, and this in a somewhat tentative manner, is one which is "the deformity of things", and in fact consists in the order of the universe. "I submit," he says, "that there is nothing absurd and nothing negligent in such a theism." It is not clear what is meant by negligence, but it does seem to be in the strict sense absurd, in that God's being is equated with His likeness. What is His likeness like? At any rate, the assertion leaves no room for any kind of theism.

If, then, we can hardly accept either the presumptions or the main conclusions of this book, this is not to say that it is to be thought of little value. On the contrary, the very clarity with which these opinions are stated has a purifying effect on the mind; and more important still, there is much that is undoubtedly true as well in many of the criticisms as in the constructive sections of the argument. Lecture II, on the Nature of Mind, is an example in point. Nothing could be more trenchant than the criticism of such doctrines of mentality as those of Descartes, Hegel and Kant, all of which are described as "doctrines of mentality without a mind". Here "personal minds and their conscious quality are left in exile" and "a most peculiar situation arises. The putative 'objects' of the mind have devoured their putative parent with such industrious voracity that they come to be regarded as born orphans. An 'object', we used to believe, was always an 'object of consciousness', that of which someone was aware. We are now informed, for example in the very clear statements of Mr. Woodbridge, that 'we know what our objects are and what we may expect from them, not at all by considering their relation to consciousness but to one another', that 'there is no reason to conclude that consciousness is in any way a determining factor in the content or limitation of knowledge', and that all that is present is a set of 'manifold and irresistible meaning-connections'. In place of the conscious quality we have 'mental connections', formerly imputed to a mind, now denied that ancestry." The mere statement of this "peculiar situation" is itself a sufficient refutation of it, but Dr. Laird goes on to show that "nothing should be said to have mental properties except in its connection with an entity that has the conscious quality, or in other words, with what we commonly called a 'mind'." To do so he points out that except in cognitions of "pure emotion"—the reality of a pain may be just what is felt—our cognitions claim to have transcendent reference, as in

memory—where the very fact of errors of memory is a proof of such transcendence. It follows that if most, or any, of our cognitions are transcendent, "pure phenomenism is an untenable theory of cognition" and therefore that "to be and to appear are *not* the same".

In this lecture also Prof. Laird has much to say which is most valuable on the reality of reflexive cognition. "I believe that we are never aware without being aware of something. But I hold that we are also reflexively self-aware." This is the solid rock on which subjective idealism and phenomenism break and are shattered.

The following lecture on the Implications of Idealism contains some well-expressed criticisms of Kant's "Thing-in-itself"; as when it is asked: "What can be meant by knowing that something exists if we do not have the faintest inkling of its nature and properties?" In general it may safely be said that the author is more at home with that part of his subject which deals with mind than he is when speaking of Deity, though throughout he is invigorating in his probing questions, as in the inquiry how God "knows" pain if He does not feel it. Perhaps the weakness on the strictly theological side of the discussion may be due to Prof. Laird's confessed lack of personal "religious experience", and to his consequent exclusion of it from his data. It is difficult to see why he should so exclude it, since though he may not have had such experience himself it exists and is part of the evidence.

This is a fine and valuable book, particularly for theists to help them in testing their fundamental beliefs.

An impressive-looking volume has lately been published on the history of Scholasticism.¹ There is, no doubt, room for such a work, in spite of the outstanding merits of Prof. de Wulf's *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*; but the present book, notwithstanding its bulk, or largely because of it, is sadly disappointing. The author tells us that he has spent ten years on its compilation, and it is plain that much labour has been devoted to it, but this is robbed of its fruits by faults of method and by inaccuracy. In these days authors are scarcely to be blamed for misprints, but it seems hardly possible that the large number of grammatical errors in this book are due to faulty proof-reading. Such mistakes, however, are only an annoyance, and would be of little consequence if the information given could be relied on. Unfortunately this is not so. To quote one instance: "St. Thomas was able to extend Aristotle's conception of being by positing that 'God alone is Being' and that all else has but contingent Being, that is contingent on God's Will both for creation and preservation." This idea of contingency is definitely misleading, as is the author's account of St. Thomas's theory of the principle of individuation. "St. Thomas's thesis would appear to be that it is not matter in general, but only 'this determined' matter, which receives the form, by which the composite is brought into act, and that such matter has previously been determined, from matter in general, by quantity." Some statements seem to be nearly unintelligible: "By proportion, the analogy of an intrinsic attribution, as a common term is applied to many objects owing to a relation; this relation is of such a kind that the term belongs primarily to one and secondarily to others in an order of subordination, e.g.

¹ *History of the Schoolmen*. By E. Crowdsen Thomas, (Williams & Norgate. 30s. net.)

a common name where the meaning is relatively diverse and simply one." There is surely confusion of thought as well as of expression here.

More general defects of the work are that it embraces more than is practically useful, beginning as it does with Thales and including a great number of obscure and irrelevant names. For example "Pierre Helie was a grammarian of considerable renown . . . he eschewed all philosophy." More important, perhaps, is that though the author states that he means "to deal in a concise manner with that body of thought which is comprised under the term of Scholastic Philosophy", he nevertheless includes large sections on the theological opinions of the Scholastics. So we have a chapter of eighty-five pages devoted to the "Dogmatic Theology" of St. Thomas, which, incidentally, contains some strange versions of theology, as when we are told that St. Thomas "denied that she (the B.V. Mary) was free from the guilt to which the whole nature is subject, so as to enter Paradise otherwise than through the sacrifice of Christ. It was not till the Council of the Vatican, 1870 A.D., that the Roman Church adopted the contrary view of the Immaculate Conception."

This is not a reliable work.

R. P. PHILLIPS.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

ST. GEORGE—PATRON OR PROTECTOR?

The dedication of this country to Our Lady and to St. Peter, ordered by the *Ritus Servandus* to be renewed yearly, seems to argue that these and not St. George are the patrons of England. This view is confirmed by the fact that St. George was declared its "protector" by Benedict XIV. Which saint is actually the patron of this country, and what is the difference between "patron" and "protector"? (W. S.)

REPLY

(i) "Patron" and "protector" are, in liturgical usage, synonymous, though the former is more common in the decrees of the *Congregation of Rites*. "In sensu liturgico sanctus ille qui ab aliquo pago vel civitate, provincia aut regno eligitur ut christianae plebi in periculis succurrat, in necessitatibus opem ferat et apud Deum reorum causam gerat, dicitur loci patronus."¹ "On appelle patron d'un lieu le saint qui a été choisi et est honoré comme le protecteur spécial d'une nation, etc."² In classical use "patronus" was one who protected a region or province, and the word was also used for one who advocated the cause of a client in a court of justice;

¹ Piacenza, quoted in *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 1927, p. 117.

² Hebert, *Leçons de Liturgie*, I, §103.

Lewis and Short give "protector" as the first meaning of the word, and of others derived from it. In ecclesiastical use both meanings are applicable to a patron saint.

(ii) St. George is the patron of England and was honoured as such centuries before Benedict XIV declared him to be the kingdom's protector. He is styled "patron" in various documents regulating his feast, e.g. 13 March, 1853 and 26 January, 1852; in others he is named "protector", e.g. 28 December, 1856; both terms are used 24 May, 1863: "cuius patronus atque invictus protector ab antiquissimis temporibus fuit, et de quo statuit Benedictus XIV per decretum S.R.C. sub die 8 January, 1749, ut in Suffragiis Sanctorum fiat in Anglia tantum commemoratio S. Georgii Angliae Patroni . . ." ¹

If any further proof is needed, it is found in the fact that the liturgical privileges and honours permitted by the *Congregation of Rites* on the feast of the principal patron of a country are everywhere in England enjoyed on the feast of St. George. "Feriatio", which includes the obligation of hearing Mass, is no longer the rule in the common law from Canon 1247 §2, but the obligation of *Missa pro Populo* remains. Relying on this liturgical celebration of St. George's Day, the *Catholic Directory* rightly puts this saint as the patron of England at the head of the list.

(iii) In the allocution of Leo XIII replying to an address presented to him by English pilgrims, 27 February, 1893, the Holy Father spoke of the devotion of the English to Our Lady and to the Prince of the Apostles the "Primary patron" of the Kingdom. He exhorted them to revive devotion to these "two patrons of the Faith" and continued: "we most earnestly exhort the faithful of England to follow the example of their forefathers, and, by a solemn religious rite, to dedicate and consecrate the whole country to the most holy Mother of God, and to the Blessed Prince of the Apostles". In compliance with the Holy Father's desire, the dedicatory prayers in the *Ritus Servandus* were introduced and ordered to be recited on the days specified. ² In the same year the additional prayer commemorating this double "dedication" was added to the Mass of the *English Martyrs*, 4 May.

This does create a difficulty which is not avoided by regarding St. George as the *secondary* patron, since—quite apart from the popular persuasion that he is *primary*—the liturgical privileges enjoyed are not permitted on the feasts of secondary patrons. ³ One solution is to regard Our Lady, St. Peter and St. George as "patroni aequae principales"; ⁴ the liturgical privileges proper to a principal patron are inoperative on 29 June since the Feast has them already; for Our Lady it would be necessary, it seems, to choose one of her feasts and celebrate it as the patronal day.

Failing a better and an authoritative solution, our own view is that Pope Leo XIII spoke in reply to an address which mentioned Our Lady and St. Peter as patrons in a wide sense of the word: England is traditionally called Our Lady's dowry, and the devotion of the English to St. Peter, as witnessed in the number of churches dedicated to him from the earliest

¹ *Decreta IV Conc. Prov. West.*, ed. 2, pp. 84, 139, 143, 145, 203.

² The Pope's allocution may be seen in *Decrees of the Leeds Synods* (1911), p. 181. Cf. *Westminster* (Diocesan) *Synod XXXII* (1893), p. 40.

³ Cf. *Ephemerides Liturgicae, Jus et Praxis*, 1939, p. 99.

⁴ *Decreta Authentica* n. 3863 mentions such.

times, is beyond all doubt. But the idea of a country being Our Lady's dowry is not exactly that of her being its patron saint; and the notion of the "titular" of a church is wholly different from that of "patron of a place": for one thing, a Divine Person or mystery may be the titular but obviously not the patron.¹ The patron of a country, at least since 1630, may be constituted only on certain conditions; amongst others the approval of the Congregation of Rites is required.² But, with proper authority, there is nothing to prevent the dedication of a country or of a community to any Divine Person or to any saint; our *Ritus Servandus* contains dedications or consecrations to Christ the King and to the Sacred Heart, as well as to Our Lady and to St. Peter; it is a matter of popular devotion aroused by some event or emergency. But the patron saint of a country is permanently in that position, whether there is a popular devotion or not, and we think it as certain as anything can be that the principal patron saint of the English is St. George.

E. J. M.

CHOICE OF OFFICE

It has been stated in this journal (e.g. 1941, xxi, 361; 1938, xiv, 449) that the opinion may be safely followed which permits a priest, two or three times a year, to recite another office *devotionis causa* provided it is not notably shorter. Is this liberty restricted to the choice of an office from one's own breviary? (F.)

REPLY

(i) It is to be restricted, in our opinion, to the choice of an office from one's own breviary. This seems a necessary conclusion from such texts as that in *Divino Afflatu*: "Sciant se tam gravi non satisfacturos officio, nisi nostrum hunc Psalterii ordinem adhibeant" and from equivalent phrases in the Bull prefixed to the Breviary of Pius V. Hence a priest may not, on the one hand, recite office from a different breviary even only once in the year; on the other hand, by way of compensation, he is not bound to make use of a different breviary if he cannot procure his own.³

(ii) The above is the common law, but with an indult many departures from it are possible. Thus nearly every Benedictine monastery has an indult permitting secular priests visiting the monastery to fulfil their obligation by reciting the monastic office in choir with the monks. The private recitation of the monastic office out of devotion two or three times a year, e.g. on the feast of St. Benedict, is not, we think, included in the liberty of choice discussed in (i). An indult would have to be obtained for this purpose, and it may well be that priest-oblates in certain places obtain from their status the right or the obligation of using the monastic breviary.

¹ Cf. *Periodica*, 1937, p. 395; Callewaert, *Liturgicae Institutiones*, II, §377.

² *Decreta Authentica*, 23 March, 1630, n. 526.

³ Cf. 1941, xx, p. 257, where this latter point is made more precise.

It seems, however, that an indult of this kind would not easily be granted to a beneficed priest since he is bound, in principle, to recite the office appropriate to his church.

E. J. M.

CIBORIUM LID AND VEIL

In distributing Holy Communion, is there a preceptive rubric that the priest must remove the veil before the lid? Many priests remove both lid and veil together in one action. (C.)

REPLY

Rituale Romanum, Tit. iv, cap. ii: ". . . extrahit pyxidem, et illam super corporale depositam discooperit". As far as we can discover, this is the only rubric on the subject and it is not amplified by any instructions from the Congregation of Rites.

One modern commentator, Crogaert, *Caeremoniale*, II, p. 275 (1935), sanctions a practice which approximates to that of many priests who are accustomed to remove both lid and veil in one action: "Pyxidem discooperit et cooperulum cum velo super corporale deponit." Many other writers merely repeat the words of the rubric.

In our view the correct method is first to remove the veil and place it outside the corporal; then the lid, which should be placed on the corporal. This is the teaching of many rubricians, e.g. S.L.T. in the (American) *Ecclesiastical Review*, 1905, xxxii, p. 273; O'Callaghan, *Sacred Ceremonies of Low Mass* (1924) p. 170; Hebert, *Leçons de Liturgie*, I, p. 284. It is taught in two places by Fr. O'Connell, a most exact and careful writer who is *facile princeps* amongst all the commentators on the subject: *The Celebration of Mass*, (1940) II, pp. 152 and 156.

The reasons for the above teaching are not given by these rubricians. We may suggest, firstly, that the alternative method is, liturgically speaking, somewhat slovenly; secondly, as noted by Wuest-Mullaney in *Matters Liturgical* (1926), p. 102, there is some danger of touching and disturbing the sacred species if the veil is removed at the same time as the lid. There is, indeed, no explicit rubric against the practice, but if we may adapt a term from the dogmatic theologians, the correct practice might be called a liturgical "conclusion" drawn from premises one of which is a liturgical rule and the other perceived by the light of unaided reason: in principle a veil should not be placed on the corporal; but the lid of the ciborium should, because it pertains to a vessel which either contains the sacred species or is unpurified. The veil, accordingly, must be parted from the lid, in order to put each where it belongs, and it is easier to remove the veil first before the lid.

E. J. M.

MIXED MARRIAGE—INVALID DISPENSATION

A priest when applying for a dispensation gives "periculum matrimonii civilis" as the canonical cause. What should he do if he discovers, either before or after the marriage, that this alleged reason is certainly untrue? (P. P.)

REPLY

Canon 1054: Dispensatio a minore impedimento concessa, nullo sive obreptionis sive subreptionis vitio irritatur, etsi unica causa finalis in precibus exposita falsa fuerit. ("Mixed Religion" is not in the list of minor impediments in canon 1042 §2.)

Canon 1061 §1: Ecclesia super impedimento mixtae religionis non dispensat, nisi: 1. urgeant iustae ac graves causae. . . .

(i) The question can be answered only by deciding whether "mixed religion" is a minor impediment, about which there is some dispute. Cf. De Smet, *De Matrimonio*, §464, 8, n.4; Cappello, *De Matrimonio*, §206. It seems to us quite certain that it is not a minor impediment and is not therefore subject to the indulgent rule of canon 1054: firstly, because it is not in the list given in canon 1042 §2; secondly, because a grave cause is required for its dispensation. The distinction between major and minor impediments is based entirely on the difficulty of getting them dispensed, and the fact that "mixed religion" is merely a prohibiting impediment does not for that reason place it in the category of those which are "minor": we all know that, in many dioceses, it is not at all easy to get a dispensation.

A further point, summarized in *Jus Pontificium*, 1929, ix, p. 238, is that the distinction between "major" and "minor" has no reference to the prohibiting impediments at all; "mixed religion" is neither major nor minor, and the rule, therefore, of canon 1054 is inapplicable. Thus in a decree, *S. C. Consistorialis*, 25 April, 1918, certain Ordinaries are given faculties to dispense: specified major impediments, minor impediments and the prohibiting impediment of "mixed religion".

(ii) If the error is detected before the marriage takes place, a fresh dispensation must be obtained, since the first was invalid; if afterwards, there can be no question of revalidating the marriage since it is already valid, but the married condition of the parties is unlawful and, in the strict rigour of the law, this can be rectified only by dispensation. Assuming that the guarantees are in order, it would suffice to inform the Ordinary of the circumstances, since a certain grave cause for dispensation now exists—marriage already contracted.

E. J. M.

CHURCH MANAGEMENT

EVENING SERVICE (II)

A PREVIOUS note on this subject was based on the assumption that the Service would follow the usual form of Rosary, Sermon, and Benediction. But there are a number of other Devotions which, with a little ingenuity, can be fitted into the R.S.B. formula to vary the monotony of the Evening Service. It need not entail the sacrifice of any of the usual features, but, unless the Service is to be unduly protracted, it will call for a certain amount of condensation. This can easily be done without impairing the spirit of devotion or giving the appearance of unseemly haste.

The Holy Hour is a very popular Devotion as well as being extremely flexible. Each priest will have his own method of conducting it, so that where several priests serve a mission variety is assured. But a priest working single-handed may easily run on in a groove. However, with so much literature on the subject readily at hand, this danger should be surmounted.

The Manresa Press publishes a Choral Service for the Conversion of England, which is most suitable for the Second Sunday of each month. It consists of an antiphon, sung by the Choir, followed by a short litany of the English Martyrs, in which the Choir may sing the invocations and the Congregation the responses, and concludes with a rousing "Martyrs of England" hymn. The Service takes about ten minutes.

Towards the end of last century the Jesuits in Manchester published a Choral Service in honour of the Sacred Heart. It takes a little longer than the above—about fifteen minutes. The chief feature is the Litany of the Holy Name, sung by the Choir and the Congregation. The music is tuneful, not difficult, and nicely varied.

Compline, the most perfect of all Evening Devotions, does not enjoy the same favour in the north of the country as in the south. It is hard to give a reason for this. Perhaps the humdrum existence which so many people in the north have to live dulls their finer powers of perception, so that they are unable to appreciate fully the beauty of the Church's Evening Prayer. At any rate, one knows few places in the north where it has succeeded as a public Evening Devotion, and many where it has failed. But that is no reason why it should not be tried now and again; for example, at the mid-week Service.

There are other Devotions which have a special appeal only at certain seasons of the year. But surely it is a good thing to incorporate these Devotions into the Evening Service—not necessarily on a Sunday night—in order to focus the attention of our people on the mystery involved or on the particular object of their suffrages. In this class one would place the Rosary of the Seven Dolours or a part of the Jesus Psalter (for Lent); Devotions for the Holy Souls or the Bona Mors (for November); the Mysteries of the Holy Childhood (for Christmas-time); Devotions to the Sacred Heart (for June). These are but a few, and can all be found in the Manual of Prayers. The *Raccolta* will provide many more.

Finally, it should be noted that these are merely suggestions for brighten-

ing t
Servi
sion
devo

Old

WIT
in ha
scatt
form
years
had
genu
rather
proof
is oc
usefu
Histo
days
Dicti
thes
Dom
atten
and

W
for t
is ap
of th
T
of th
clear
hand
may
again
does
be su

The S
(
Dr. M
bran

ing the Evening Service. The writer is not advocating that the Evening Service should be remodelled on the above lines, but merely that the occasional introduction of fresh matter may help to preserve interest and rekindle devotion.

W. P. S.

BOOK REVIEWS

Old Catholic Lancashire. Vol. III. By Dom F. O. Blundell, O.S.B. (Burns Oates & Washbourne. 6s.)

WITH this volume Dom Odo Blundell completes the great work he took in hand some years ago. With infinite patience he has gathered up the scattered fragments of our history and has cleverly pieced them together to form so many cameos of Catholic life in the County Palatine between the years 1550 and 1850. One could have wished, however, that the author had tested each fragment with the same skill and care before accepting it as genuine. There are some which definitely belong to the realms of fiction rather than history. Also, there are several misprints which more careful proof-reading would have eliminated. Because of these things the book is occasionally unreliable as history. But that is not to say that it is not a useful book to have. It contains copious extracts from the *Victoria County History of Lancashire* (an expensive book and difficult to obtain in these days), from Catholic Record Society publications, from Gillow's *Biographical Dictionary of English Catholics*, and from letters in private collections. For these things alone the book is well worth the money. But there is more. Dom Odo has arranged and collated these extracts, and only one who has attempted to unravel the history of his own parish can appreciate the labour and the patience that have been involved in such a task.

We in Lancashire are most grateful to Dom Odo for these three volumes, for they will help us to know and to value our glorious past—a past that is apt to be obscured, if not obliterated altogether, by the smoke and grime of the Industrial Revolution.

The publishers have treated us handsomely with regard to the format of the book. The quality of the paper is excellent for these days, the print clear and the binding strong; in short, a pre-war vintage. Moreover, it is handsomely illustrated with a number of well-produced photographs, which may become extremely valuable later on, should Lancashire be subjected again to intensive enemy air raids. The photograph of Euxton Hall (p. 176) does scant justice to the beauty of the place: no doubt a better one will be substituted for it in subsequent editions.

W. P. S.

The Successful Error: A Critical Study of Psycho-Analysis. By Rudolf Allers. (Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.)

DR. RUDOLF ALLERS in this new book condemns psycho-analysis root and branch, and the branch because of the root. To vary the metaphor slightly

he argues that a bad tree cannot bring forth good fruit. The Freudian system, based though it is on erroneous philosophy, has had a glittering success. "The nineteenth century, it is said, will be called the century of Freud." Its success is due to its being "a compromise of divergent and even contradictory sets of ideas" which marked the transitional period of culture corresponding to Freud's lifetime. It combines the scientism of the last century with the growing appreciation of the wholeness of human nature which is manifest today. Indeed Dr. Allers regards it as "Freud's greatest and most unexpected achievement" that "he restored the knowledge of the leading rôle of the mind, the knowledge of the dominating place held by the soul in human nature".

In his capacity as a philosopher the author shows that, employing a set of false axioms, the system is based on a philosophy that is materialistic, hedonistic, subjectivist and impersonalistic. Many of its "facts" are unproven, its logic is vitiated, and it lacks self-consistency. As a psychiatrist he maintains that the exclusive claims of the psycho-analysts to success in the treatment of mental disorders are unsubstantiated.

But he has little hope of converting the convinced psycho-analyst. His intention is rather to warn others, especially Catholics, off dangerous ground. In particular he argues against those who think that they can dissociate the practice of psycho-analysis from its underlying philosophy. The Freudian is right in maintaining that it is all in all or not at all. He does not deny the value of such an element of the technique as free association. His challenge is to the psycho-analysis of Freud and his disciples, "including some dissenters who, like Jung and Stekel, go on believing the bulk of Freudian ideas".

This warning is very much to the point, and deserves the careful attention of all those who, with various degrees of competence, have been led to the practice of psycho-analysis. The chapter on Education will also put educationalists on their guard against the infiltration of crude psycho-analytic ideas into the field of pedagogics.

This radical treatment of the subject is far more scientific and far more effective than the more usual and easier peripheral attack on the score of moral offensiveness, grave and obvious as are the grounds of such an attack in psycho-analytic literature.

The book will provide an adequate account of a difficult subject for those whose business it is to know the nature of psycho-analysis, but whose conscience or natural inclination would prevent their exploration of the sources.

Dr. Allers' competence is beyond dispute, and he has embodied a trenchant criticism in a very interesting and informative book.

Angel's Mirror. By a Dominican Sister. (Sands. Pp. 100. 5s.)

THE dearth of first-class reading books for children, which left so large a gap in the religious training of the young a generation ago, no longer exists. Lately, and in particular during the past decade, many capable Catholic authors have written children's books of a kind both instructive and enjoyable, with the result that no mother or teacher need be without an excellent Child's Library. *Angel's Mirror* must find a place in any such collection.

where it will probably be acclaimed by grown-ups and little ones alike as a queen among commoners.

After a somewhat overlong look at the Earth Beautiful, three delightful children find that their picnic has become a pilgrimage, with a gorgeous Blue Angel to lead the way. They get a glimpse of Hell, a glance into Purgatory and a steady gaze into Heaven. We are not going to tell you any more about them or their adventures, because we do not want to anticipate your pleasure in turning the pages of this lovely book, a book first in a thousand.

L. T. H.

In Soft Garments. By the Right Rev. Mgr. Ronald Knox. (Burns Oates. Pp. 188. 6s. net.)

ALMOST every reader of this journal is a priest, or a student for the priesthood, one who is therefore always on the look-out for any book that may prove to be a help in preparing sermons and instructions. Preaching does not become more easy as the days go by, but it is a part of our duty that must be done, and done well, if good seed is to be sown against a full harvest. This latest volume of pulpit addresses by Mgr. Knox, given at Oxford during his Chaplaincy, contains the best work he has done—and he has done much—in Catholic Apologetics. It may be recommended without reserve to all, but especially to priests and young laymen.

It is unnecessary to describe these discourses in detail. They touch upon various important aspects of the Faith, from the proofs of God's existence to the Seventh Sacrament. In the "last scene of all" we find the author bidding farewell to his audience of young friends, an elevating chapter for its wisdom, but a sad one too, because it gives the impression of a premature ending to a splendid series. One sentence calls for qualification. The author says that the work of a University Chaplain is written in water, but we think that this particular work will remain as a permanent guide to undergraduates in learning through their Faith to become virtuous and influential Catholic laymen.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

CATHOLIC ACTION

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1941, XXI, p. 320; 1942, XXII, p. 95.)

Fr. Ripley writes:

Dr. Park's comments on the above subject are interesting and with a good deal of what he says I agree, notably with his remark that the parochial activity of the Legion of Mary may indeed be our real long-term policy. However, my primary object in writing was not to put across propaganda for the Legion of Mary, nor was my article "all-embracing", as I explicitly stated: "It is simply a question of emphasis."

"How are we going to affect the life of the nation?" asks Dr. Park. I might reply by asking another question: "How did Our Lord affect the

life of the Roman Empire?" It was not by grandiose plans expounded from public platforms; it was not even by the circulation of literature. It was by the training of a small nucleus of apostolic men who would permeate the masses of the people. "To what shall I liken the kingdom of God? It is like leaven, which a woman took and buried in three measures of flour until all of it was leavened." (Luke xiii, 21.) By all means let us try every means in our power to reconvert England; let us have our mass demonstrations, let us have our Evidence platforms in the streets, let us have our study circles, but, above all, let us put first things first. We cannot fly before we can walk.

In the long run it will probably be proved that our first work must be in the parishes, where nuclei of trained apostles must be formed. Preaching to the people from a background of lapsed Catholicism, or of practising Catholicism which is not patently a living force, with a life above that of its milieu, will produce remarkably little fruit. Recently a prominent Irish writer remarked that the great Social Encyclicals, which were documents every bit as revolutionary as The Communist Manifesto, were rendered null because of the apathy of the Catholic body. I am convinced that the first stage in the conversion of England must be the sanctification of the people within our own parishes and the formation amongst them of an apostolic sense. The second stage is the Catholicizing of the environment and of the nation. To begin the second without the first is like attempting to roof a house before the foundations are laid. . . .

Dr. Park half suggests that the Legion of Mary confines itself to purely parochial works. That is not so. A little beyond such works, but allied to them, are the non-parochial but purely pastoral works for seamen (witness the wonderful work done by the Legion for the Apostleship of the Sea in Liverpool), for the degraded classes (who has not heard of the vast system of Legion hostels now spread throughout the English-speaking world?) retreats for students, youth, non-Catholics, etc. These are dealt with by the Legion simultaneously with parochial works. Actually the Legion takes into account *all* possible ways of reaching souls. Regular retreats are held for Irish Protestants at Blackrock College, which are regularly attended by well over a hundred; and a series of Labour Conferences was recently organized with conspicuous success also in Dublin. I cite these as examples of how the work of the Legion is spreading in accordance with the progressive apostolate.

I suggest, then, that the answer to the question raised by Dr. Park is that we must create an army, a rank and file that will be trained to carry out a plan according to instructions. The Conversion of England is a vast apostolate, a great battle. Then why not begin in the obvious way by training apostles within each parish? In the end, the slowest way will probably prove to be the quickest.

THE MEDIATION OF OUR LADY (CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, pp. 97-106.)

Mgr. R. L. Smith writes:

Fr. Sylvester O'Brien, in the March CLERGY REVIEW, quotes Pius XI as saying to some Spanish pilgrims: "You young people ought to

associate yourselves with the thoughts and desires of Most Holy Mary, who is our Mother and Coredemptrix" (p. 101). Father O'Brien ends the quotation there, but actually the Pope went on to say: "You too must make every effort to be coredeemers and apostles in the spirit of Catholic Action." Here is the Italian text in full: "Quei giovani dovevano seguire il pensiero ed il desiderio di Maria Santissima, che è nostra Madre e Corredentrice nostra; dovevano sforzarsi ad essere, anch' essi, corredentori ed apostoli, secondo lo spirito dell' Azione Cattolica."

Although Father O'Brien does not give the full quotation, he admits (p. 102) that Pius XI urged "his hearers to co-operate with Mary in the work of coredemption". But nowhere does he acknowledge that the Pope actually used the very title for them which he had just applied to our Lady: as she was Coredemptrix, so these Spanish pilgrims must make themselves coredeemers.

Doesn't this make a difference? Pius XI was well aware that at this particular time the question was being widely discussed and that many petitions were being presented to the Holy See for a definition of the doctrine. So we should expect him to have weighed his words when attributing to living members of Catholic Action a function which some wanted defining as a prerogative of the Mother of God.

VERNACULAR HYMNS AT BENEDICTION

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 92.)

An Ushaw student sends the following useful note:

(1) S.R.C. 31 August, 1867, m. 3157.8. *Q.* An liceat adhibere publicam quarundam precum recitationem vulgari sermone conscriptarum coram SSmo Sacramento exposito. . . ? *R.* Affirmative, dummodo agatur de precibus approbatis.

(2) S.R.C. 27 February, 1882, n. 3537, 3: *Q.* Num liceat generaliter ut chorus musicorum (i.e. cantores) coram SSmo Sacramento solemniter exposito decantet hymnos in lingua vernacula?

R. Posse: dummodo non agatur de hymnis "Te Deum" et aliis quibuscumque liturgicis precibus quae non nisi latina lingua decantari debent.

O'Loan, *The Ceremonies of Some Ecclesiastical Functions* (Dublin, Browne and Nolan, 1901), p. 156, n. 2, comments as follows: "The hymns, etc., sung in the presence of the Blessed Sacrament should have episcopal approbation. The Bishop may approve of hymns and prayers composed in the vernacular, but not of translations of the 'Te Deum' or similar liturgical prayers, which, if recited at all, must be recited in their Latin form."

(3) *Ritus Servandus*, Praenotanda, no. 5: "Per hoc licentia conceditur canendi coram SSmo exposito sequentes hymnos lingua vulgari: 'Jesus, my Lord, my God, my All'; 'Sweet Sacrament Divine'."

(4) Bishop of Middlesbrough, Ad Clerum, 24 August, 1934: "The Archbishops and Bishops at their Low Week meeting approved of the following additional hymns for use in English at Benediction and Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament:

- (1) Soul of My Saviour.
- (2) O Bread of Heaven.
- (3) Jesus, the Only Thought of Thee.
- (4) O Godhead Hid, Devoutly I Adore Thee."

Canon Mahoney writes :

The Clergy will be grateful for having their attention called to the 1934 direction of the bishops which is not universally known. "O Godhead Hid" is omitted from the new (1940) Westminster Hymnal ; it is n. 76 in the former (1916) book and its use may be continued until the bishops withdraw it. S.R.C. n. 3537.3 is reaffirmed in nn. 4235, 8 and 4268.10. To the criticism that "Adoro Te Devote" is a liturgical text and, therefore, excluded by the common law, it may be observed that it is, indeed, in the Missal among the private thanksgiving prayers of the priest after Mass, but it is not prescribed as an integral part of the public office, and is not, therefore, liturgical in the proper sense of the word.

ST. VALENTINE

(CLERGY REVIEW, 1942, XXII, p. 113)

The Rev. S. Landreth, Vicar of Ven. Bede, Monkwearmouth, writes :

I regret that Mgr. Knox should have been distracted in his reciting of his office on Feb. 14th by speculations on the "surreptitious consecration" given by the Anglican reformers to St. Valentine. If he will refer to his Roman Martyrology, he will find that two martyrs named Valentine are commemorated on that day, and that one of them was a bishop. It was this one whom the reformers took over from the Sarum books.

Probably the other Valentine is designated "Priest and Martyr" to distinguish him from his namesake.

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

to the
odhead
in the
hdraw
To the
cluded
Missal
ut it is
efore,

s :
eciting
nsecra-
refer to
ine are
was this
to dis-